

















# HISTORY

The Journal of the Historical Association

EDITED BY

ALFRED COBBAN, M.A., Ph.D.

Professor of French History in the University of London

Assistant Editor: R. H. C. DAVIS, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford

Hon. Financial Secretary: H. C. DAVIS, M.A.

VOLUME XLIII

1958



Published for  
THE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION  
*by Routledge and Kegan Paul*



ser. 2

v. 43

1958

# REVIEWS AND SHORT NOTICES

## ANCIENT

KÖHLER, <i>Hebrew Man</i> by S. Stein .. .. .	43
GOMME, <i>Historical Commentary on Thucydides</i> by J. H. Kells .. .. .	43
SCHMITTLEIN, <i>La première campagne de César contre les Germains</i> by J. P. V. D. Balsdon ..	44
Short Notices.. .. .	45

## MEDIEVAL

COULBORN, <i>Feudalism in History</i> by Eric John .. .. .	45
NITEMAA, <i>Das Strandrecht in Nordeuropa im Mittelalter</i> by Edward Miller .. .. .	46
COHN, <i>The Pursuit of the Millennium</i> by Denys Hay .. .. .	47
FRASER, <i>A History of Antony Bek</i> by Frank Barlow .. .. .	48
WATKIN (ed.), <i>The Great Charters of Glastonbury</i> , iii by C. R. Cheney .. .. .	49
AYALON, <i>Gunpowder and Firearms in the Mamluk kingdom</i> by Michael Howard .. .. .	50
BURNE, <i>The Agincourt War</i> by T. H. McGuffie .. .. .	51
DUNLOP (ed.), <i>Calendar of Scottish Supplications to Rome</i> by L. J. Macfarlane .. .. .	52
Short Notices.. .. .	52

## EARLY MODERN

JEDIN, <i>History of the Council of Trent</i> , i by H. G. Koenigsberger .. .. .	53
WILLAN, <i>Early History of the Russia Company</i> by D. B. Quinn .. .. .	54
ORCIBAL, <i>Port-Royal, entre le miracle et l'obéissance</i> by H. G. Judge .. .. .	55

## LATER MODERN

SAMPSON, <i>Progress in the Age of Reason</i> ; CRANSTON, <i>John Locke</i> ; COLIE, <i>Light and Enlightenment</i> ; WILSON, <i>Diderot</i> ; MCGLOY, <i>Humanitarian Movement in Eighteenth-century France</i> by A. Cobban .. .. .	55
JARVIS, <i>Customs Letter Books of Liverpool, 1711-1813</i> ; HYDE, <i>Blue Funnel, 1865-1914</i> by F. W. Brooks .. .. .	58
BROOKE, <i>The Chatham Administration</i> by Steven Watson .. .. .	59
LAUERMA, <i>L'artillerie de campagne française pendant les guerres de la Révolution</i> by T. H. McGuffie .. .. .	60
TAYLOR, <i>The Trouble Makers</i> by W. L. Burn .. .. .	61
YOUNG and HANDCOCK (eds.), <i>English Historical Documents, vol. XII (1)</i> by A. J. Taylor ..	63
JOHNSON, <i>General T. Perronet Thompson</i> by John Roach .. .. .	63
COWHERD, <i>The Politics of English Dissent</i> by R. W. Greaves .. .. .	64
LESLIE, <i>Polish Politics and the Revolution of 1830</i> by A. Bruce Boswell .. .. .	65
BURT, <i>Evolution of British Empire and Commonwealth</i> ; WILSON, <i>Rise of New Zealand Liberal Party</i> ; MILLER, <i>Richard Jebb and the problems of Empire</i> by A. F. M. Madden .. .. .	66
DIKÉ, <i>Trade and Politics in the Niger Delta 1830-95</i> by Eveline Martin .. .. .	66
PETROVITCH, <i>Russian Pan Slavism, 1856-1870</i> ; RAEFF, <i>Siberia and the Reforms of 1822</i> ; GROTTIAN, <i>Das Sowjetische Regierungssystem</i> ; KRYPTON, <i>Northern Sea Route</i> ; ST. ANTHONY'S PAPERS, <i>Soviet Affairs</i> by W. E. Mosse .. .. .	67
YESELSON, <i>United States-Persian diplomatic relations 1883-1921</i> by Rose Louise Greaves ..	69
WOLFE, <i>Three who made a Revolution</i> by G. H. Bolsover .. .. .	70
KENNAN, <i>Russia leaves the War</i> by Esmond Wright .. .. .	70
Short Notices.. .. .	71

## THE AMERICAS

BESTERMAN (ed.), <i>Relations de ce qui s'est passé au pays des Hurons</i> ; REVERDIN, <i>Quatorze Calvinistes chez les Topinambous</i> by D. B. Quinn .. .. .	73
HAMILTON, <i>Barbados and the Confederation Question</i> by Elsa Goveia .. .. .	73
TRIPATHI, <i>Evolution of Historiography in America</i> ; MORTON (ed.), <i>Present State of Virginia</i> ; UHLENDORF, <i>Letters and Journals of Major Baumeister</i> ; STÄDTLER, <i>Die Ansbach-Bayreuther Truppen</i> ; HOLLON AND BUTLER, <i>William Bollaert's Texas</i> ; BROWN, <i>Charles Beard and the Constitution</i> ; BEMIS, <i>John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy</i> ; JOHN QUINCY ADAMS and the Union; GARRETT, <i>Sherman's March through the Carolinas</i> ; CATTON, <i>This Hallowed Ground</i> by Marcus Cunliffe .. .. .	74

## ASIA

BROWN, <i>The Indian Christians of St. Thomas</i> by A. L. Basham .. .. .	79
STORRY, <i>The Double Patriots</i> by Kan'ichi Fukuda .. .. .	80

## GENERAL

TOYNBEE, <i>An Historian's approach to Religion</i> ; HOOKE, <i>The Siege Perilous</i> by W. H. C. Frend .. .. .	81
--	----

## Documents of Modern Political Thought

T. E. UTLEY AND J. S. MACLURE

This book replaces Professor Oakshott's *Social and Political Doctrines of Contemporary Europe*. It has five sections: Representative Democracy, Communism, Papal Political Theory, Romantic Authoritarianism, and Protestant Political Thought.

22s. 6d. net

## Selected Historical Essays

F. W. MAITLAND

A selection of thirteen essays chosen from Maitland's shorter writings, showing his contributions to the history of English law and institutions, edited with an introduction by Miss H. M. Cam. Published in association with the Selden Society.

27s. 6d. net

## Australian Federal Politics & Law, 1901-1929

GEOFFREY SAWER

A description of the legal origin and structure of the first Commonwealth Parliament, and the activities of its successors. MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

57s. 6d. net

## American Judaism

NATHAN GLAZER

An historical survey of the Jewish religion in America. A new volume in the series *The Chicago History of American Civilization*. UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS.

26s. net

## Parliament

SIR IVOR JENNINGS

A new edition, completely revised and re-set, of the standard work on Parliament. A companion volume to *Cabinet Government*. SECOND EDITION.

60s. net

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

BENTLEY HOUSE, 200 EUSTON ROAD, LONDON, N.W.1



# REVIEWS AND SHORT NOTICES

## ANCIENT

BIBBY, <i>The Testimony of the Spade</i> by F. T. Wainwright .. .. .	124
SCHMITT, <i>Rom und Rhodos</i> by J. P. V. D. Balsdon .. .. .	125
NARAIN, <i>The Indo-Greeks</i> by F. W. Walbank .. .. .	125

## MEDIEVAL

HUSSEY, <i>The Byzantine World</i> by P. D. Whitting .. .. .	126
DAVIS, <i>A History of Medieval Europe</i> by M. D. Knowles .. .. .	127
DANIEL-ROPS, <i>Cathedral and Crusade</i> by M. Deanesly .. .. .	128
BALDWIN, <i>The History of the Crusades</i> by J. M. Hussey .. .. .	130
STENTON, <i>The Bayeux Tapestry</i> by R. H. C. Davis .. .. .	131
<i>Curia Regis</i> Rolls, 9 to 10 Henry III by Doris M. Stenton .. .. .	132
CHURCHILL, GRIFFIN and HARDMAN, <i>Calender of Kent Feet of Fines</i> by R. B. Pugh .. .. .	133
WOODCOCK, <i>Cartulary of St. Gregory, Canterbury</i> by Eric Stone .. .. .	133
DENHOLM-YOUNG, <i>Vita Edwardi Secundi</i> by Margaret Sharp .. .. .	134
EK WALL, <i>Studies on the Population of Medieval London</i> by P. E. Jones .. .. .	134
HOLMES, <i>The Estates of the Higher Nobility in XIV Century England</i> by T. B. Pugh .. .. .	135
ORIGO, <i>The Merchant of Prato</i> by H. E. Bell .. .. .	137
DU BOULAY, <i>Registrum Thome Bourghier</i> by Kathleen Edwards .. .. .	138

## EARLY MODERN

<i>Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem. Henry VII</i> by T. P. Pugh .. .. .	138
NUGENT, <i>The Thought and Culture of the English Renaissance</i> by Joel Hurstfield .. .. .	139
NICOLL, <i>The Elizabethans</i> by Joel Hurstfield .. .. .	139
BROOK, <i>Whitgift and the English Church</i> by Glanmor Williams .. .. .	141
FINCH, <i>The Wealth of Five Northamptonshire Families</i> by Joel Hurstfield .. .. .	142
POCOCK, <i>The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law</i> by Peter Laslett .. .. .	142
DAVIES, <i>The Royal African Company</i> by T. S. Willan .. .. .	144
WILSON, <i>Profit and Power</i> by Ragnhild Hatton .. .. .	145
BAXTER, <i>The Development of the Treasury, 1660-1702</i> by Edward Hughes .. .. .	146
BENNETT, <i>White Kennett, 1660-1728, Bishop of Peterborough</i> by R. C. Latham .. .. .	147

## LATER MODERN

DUNLOP, <i>A Short History of Germany</i> by Hans Liebeschütz .. .. .	149
FALK, <i>History of Germany from the Reformation to the Present Day</i> by Hans Liebeschütz .. .. .	149
HERTZ, <i>The Development of the German Public Mind</i> by Hans Liebeschütz .. .. .	149
WALLACE-HADRILL and MCMANNERS, <i>France: Government and Society</i> by Irene Collins .. .. .	150
BROGAN, <i>The French Nation from Napoleon to Pétain</i> by Irene Collins .. .. .	150
POWERS, <i>Edgar Quinet</i> by Irene Collins .. .. .	150
CHAPMAN and CHAPMAN, <i>The Life and Times of Baron Haussmann</i> by Irene Collins .. .. .	150
WHITE, <i>Waterloo to Peterloo</i> by W. H. Chaloner .. .. .	152
MACKEYS, <i>The War in the Mediterranean, 1803-1810</i> by Michael Lewis .. .. .	152
SMITH, <i>Garibaldi</i> by C. J. Lowe .. .. .	154
HAWES, <i>Henry Brougham</i> .. .. .	154
WOOD, <i>Thomas Haweis</i> .. .. .	154
HOUGHTON, <i>The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830-1870</i> by John Roach .. .. .	154
PANKHURST, <i>The Saint Simonians Mill and Carlyle</i> by John Roach .. .. .	154
O'BRIEN, <i>Parnell and His Party</i> by F. S. L. Lyons .. .. .	155
ALBERTINI, <i>The Origins of the War of 1914, vol. iii</i> by W. N. Medlicott .. .. .	156
CROUZET, <i>L'Epoque Contemporaine</i> by C. L. Mowat .. .. .	158
BRAY, <i>Voyage from Utopia</i> .. .. .	160
LATHAM, <i>Timber: A Historical Survey of Its Development and Distribution</i> .. .. .	160
RUSSELL, <i>The 'Revolt of the Field' in Lincolnshire</i> .. .. .	160
CLARK, <i>Early Modern Europe 1450-1720</i> .. .. .	160
PROUTY, <i>The Transformation of the Board of Trade</i> .. .. .	160
BIOBAKU, <i>The Egba and their Neighbours</i> by George Shepperson .. .. .	160
GRAY, <i>The British in Mombasa</i> by George Shepperson .. .. .	160
EGERTON, <i>Angola in Perspective</i> by George Shepperson .. .. .	160
SCHMITT, <i>Les Accords Secrets Franco-Britanniques de Nov.-Dec. 1940</i> .. .. .	162
RAUCH, <i>History of Soviet Russia</i> .. .. .	162
OLIVER, <i>Sir Harry Johnston and the Scramble for Africa</i> by J. D. Hargreaves .. .. .	163
BASTIN, <i>The Native Policies of Stamford Raffles</i> by Eric Stokes .. .. .	164
MENDIS, <i>Colebrooke-Cameron Papers</i> by Eric Stokes .. .. .	164

## GENERAL

PUGH and CRITALL, <i>The Victoria Country History: Wilts. vol. V</i> by Philip Styles .. .. .	165
TREVOR-ROPER, <i>Historical Essays</i> by G. R. Elton .. .. .	167
STENTON, <i>The English Woman in History</i> by Evangeline de Villiers .. .. .	167
BULTMAN, <i>History and Eschatology</i> .. .. .	170
LANCASTER, <i>Bibliography of Historical Works</i> .. .. .	170
DERRY, <i>Short History of Norway</i> , .. .. .	170
POTTER and POTTER, <i>Interiors</i> .. .. .	170

# THE LIBERAL TRADITION

FROM FOX TO KEYNES

ALAN BULLOCK AND MAURICE SHOCK

"The vision and blindness of Liberalism stand out well in the documents assembled by Mr. Bullock and Mr. Shock. They cover the ground, and there is a lot of ground to cover, apart from the politicians—the economists from Adam Smith to Keynes, the philosophers from Bentham to Herbert Spencer and D. G. Ritchie. 'The most striking thing about the Liberal tradition,' the editors say in a useful introduction, 'is its intellectual incoherence.'" *TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.*

Volume 8 in *The British Political Tradition* series. 25s. net.

## LIBRARY OF AMERICAN BIOGRAPHY

*Edited by OSCAR HANDLIN, Professor of History, Harvard*

"All scholars and those interested in American history will be glad to have this series, which is particularly valuable at a time when American studies are making rapid strides in Britain. The presence among the authors of eminent historians is a sure guarantee of the quality of the biographies."

*H. C. ALLEN, Professor of American History, London University*

*Just Published*

**BOURBON LEADER** Grover Cleveland and the Democratic Party

HORACE SAMUEL MERRILL

The biography of an obscure Buffalo lawyer who was responsible for the return to power and authority of the Democratic Party in 1884.

**RABBI IN AMERICA** The Story of Isaac M. Wise

ISRAEL KNOX

A study of the problems which beset Jewish immigrants into America during the nineteenth century and the rise of American Judaism.

*Previously published*—**U. S. Grant** by Bruce Catton, **William H. Welch** by Donald Fleming, **Elihu Root** by Richard W. Leopold, **Elisha Kent Kane** by Jeannette Mirsky, **Benjamin Franklin** by Verner W. Crane, **Samuel F. B. Morse** by Oliver W. Larkin, **Daniel Webster** by Richard Current, **William Lloyd Garrison** by Russel B. Nye, **Booker T. Washington** by Samuel R. Spencer, Jr., **Charles Evans Hughes** by Dexter Perkins, **Eli Whitney** by Constance McL. Green, **Woodrow Wilson** by John M. Blum, **James Logan** by Frederick B. Tolles, and **Henry Clay** by Clement Eaton.

*Each 18s. net*

---

## A GENERAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND

W. A. BARKER, G. R. ST. AUBYN, and R. L. OLLARD

Vol. I 1668-1832 Vol. II 1832-1950

*Each 10s. 6d.*

"Not only is it most competently produced as a textbook for school use, written in clear unpretentious English and equipped with a good index, maps and glossary, but it is academically highly respectable." *TIMES EDUC. SUPPT.* (on Vol. I).

"The answer to the prayers of all those unhappy school masters who have to teach 19th-century history below sixth-form level." *TIMES EDUC. SUPPT.* (on Vol. II).

## DOCUMENTS OF ENGLISH HISTORY

Two companion volumes, selected and edited by the same authors. *Each 6s. 6d.*

---

ADAM & CHARLES BLACK

# REVIEWS AND SHORT NOTICES

## ANCIENT

BRADFORD, <i>Ancient Landscapes</i> by M. Robertson .. .. .	216
JONES, <i>Athenian Democracy</i> by R. J. Hopper .. .. .	217
HADAS, <i>History of Rome</i> by H. H. Scullard .. .. .	219
MATTINGLY, <i>Roman Imperial Civilization</i> by H. H. Scullard .. .. .	219

## MEDIEVAL

LAISTNER, <i>Intellectual Heritage of Early Middle Ages</i> by J. M. Wallace-Hadrill .. .. .	220
DENMAN, <i>Origins of Ownership</i> by E. John .. .. .	221
KER, <i>Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon</i> by G. R. C. Davis .. .. .	222
EASSON, <i>Medieval Religious Houses, Scotland</i> by G. W. S. Barrow .. .. .	223
RAFTIS, <i>Estates of Ramsey Abbey</i> by R. H. Hilton .. .. .	223
MASSON, <i>Frederick II</i> by D. P. Waley .. .. .	224
CHAPLAIS (ed.), <i>Treaty Rolls, 1234-1325</i> by C. D. Ross .. .. .	224
JONES, <i>The Church in Chester, 1300-1540</i> by F. R. H. du Boulay .. .. .	225
BACKUS, <i>West Russian Nobles, 1377-1514</i> by W. E. Mosse .. .. .	225
DAVIS, <i>Dante and the Idea of Rome</i> by D. Nicholl .. .. .	225
<i>Calendar of Inquisitions, 1377-88</i> by E. Miller .. .. .	226
THOMSON, <i>Magistri Johannis Hus</i> by J. Crompton .. .. .	227
GEWIRTH, <i>Defensor Pacis</i> by W. Ullmann .. .. .	227
Short Notices .. .. .	230

## EARLY MODERN

HAY, <i>Europe, the Emergence of an Idea</i> by G. R. Potter .. .. .	231
HUNT, <i>Dean Colet and his Theology</i> by R. Weiss .. .. .	232
WESTPHALEN, <i>Carlos Quinto</i> by J. Lynch .. .. .	232
PEARSON, <i>Elizabethans at Home</i> by J. Hurstfield .. .. .	232
MCILWAIN and WARD (ed.), <i>Lambarde's Archeion</i> by J. E. Neale .. .. .	233
STRIKER (ed.), <i>Life of John Smith</i> by D. B. Quinn .. .. .	233
HANDOVER, <i>Arbella Stuart</i> by D. H. Willson .. .. .	234
MITCHELL, <i>Rise of the Revolutionary Party, 1603-29</i> by D. H. Pennington .. .. .	235
MOIR, <i>The Adled Parliament of 1614</i> by I. Roots .. .. .	236
MORGAN, <i>Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain</i> by G. Donaldson .. .. .	236
FRANCISCAN FATHERS, DUN MHUIRE (ed.), <i>Father Luke Wadding</i> by P. J. Dunning .. .. .	237
CARAMAN, <i>Henry Morse</i> by J. Hurstfield .. .. .	237
CRAGG, <i>Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution</i> by R. C. Latham .. .. .	238
ROWSE, <i>The Early Churchills</i> by M. A. Thomson .. .. .	238
MIDDLETON, <i>Charles, 2nd Earl of Middleton</i> by R. C. Latham .. .. .	239
Short Notices .. .. .	240

## LATER MODERN

LINDSAY (ed.), <i>New Cambridge Modern History, VII</i> by Leo Gershoy .. .. .	241
CHURCHILL, <i>History of the English-speaking Peoples, iii</i> by C. R. N. Routh .. .. .	243
GIBB and BOWEN, <i>Islamic Society and the West, I, ii</i> , by V. J. Parry .. .. .	244
FRICKE, <i>Leibniz und die englische Sukzession</i> by M. A. Thomson .. .. .	245
ELLIS, <i>Post Office in the Eighteenth Century</i> by W. R. Ward .. .. .	246
MACMAHON (ed.), <i>Beverly Corporation Minute Books (1707-1835)</i> by D. Read .. .. .	246
BUTTERFIELD, <i>George III and the Historians</i> by R. W. Greaves .. .. .	247
PRESSNELL, <i>Country Banking in the Industrial Revolution</i> by P. Mathias .. .. .	248
GRAY, <i>Highland Economy, 1750-1850</i> by W. H. B. Court .. .. .	250
POUNDS and PARKER, <i>Coal and Steel in Western Europe</i> by W. H. Chaloner .. .. .	251
ADDIS, <i>The Crawshay Dynasty, 1765-1867</i> by W. H. B. Court .. .. .	251
THOMSON, <i>Europe since Napoleon</i> ; BRUCE, <i>Shaping of the Modern World, i</i> ; HERZFELD, <i>Die Moderne Welt 1789-1945</i> by W. O. Henderson .. .. .	252
SIMON, <i>Failure of the Prussian Reform Movement</i> by J. A. Hawgood .. .. .	253
HUGHES (ed.), <i>Private Correspondence of Collingwood</i> by M. A. Lewis .. .. .	254
STUART (ed.), <i>Soldier's Glory</i> ; ASPINALL-UGLANDER, <i>Freshly Remembered</i> by S. H. F. Johnston .. .. .	254
GRAY and WALKER (ed.), <i>Records of Nottingham, viii, ix</i> , by J. D. Chambers .. .. .	255
CLIVE, <i>Scotch Reviewers: The Edinburgh Review</i> by R. J. White .. .. .	256
GROSS, <i>Charles Joseph la Trobe</i> by R. M. Hartwell .. .. .	257
PACKE, <i>The Bombs of Orsini</i> by J. P. T. Bury .. .. .	258
MEDLICOTT, <i>Bismarck, Gladstone and the Concert of Europe</i> by E. Eyck .. .. .	258
DORFALÉN, <i>Treitschke</i> by H. Liebeschütz .. .. .	259
BANKS, <i>Edward Blake</i> by J. C. Beckett .. .. .	260
WEARMOUTH, <i>Methodism in the Twentieth Century</i> by G. F. A. Best .. .. .	261
RAMSAUR, <i>The Young Turks</i> by V. J. Parry .. .. .	262



GOTTLIEB, <i>Secret Diplomacy during the First World War</i> by J. E. Tyler .. .. .	262
MACARTNEY, <i>October Fifteenth</i> ; LETTRICH, <i>Modern Slovakia</i> ; SHEPHERD, <i>Austrian Odyssey</i> by F. Spencer .. .. .	263
ERFURTH, <i>Deutschen Generalstabes von 1918 bis 1945</i> by M. Howard .. .. .	265
FREUND, <i>Unholy Alliance</i> by J. Frankel .. .. .	266
DALLIN, <i>German Rule in Russia 1941-5</i> by C. J. Child .. .. .	266
Short Notices .. .. .	267

## THE AMERICAS

DEBIEN, <i>Études Antillaises</i> by E. V. Goveia .. .. .	268
GUILLET (ed.), <i>Valley of the Trent</i> by A. F. McC. Madden .. .. .	268
ROCHE, <i>Joseph Reed</i> by J. R. Pole .. .. .	269
SMITH, <i>Professors and Public Ethics</i> by M. A. Jones .. .. .	269
COOKE, <i>Frederic Bancroft</i> by J. R. Pole .. .. .	269
ALLEN and HILL (ed.), <i>British Essays in American History</i> by W. Johnson .. .. .	270
MORGAN, <i>Birth of the Republic</i> ; ELLIS, <i>American Catholicism</i> ; MIRSKY, <i>Kane and the Seafaring Frontier</i> ; KLAY, <i>Daring Diplomacy</i> ; NICHOLS, <i>Advance Agents of American Destiny</i> ; HILL, <i>Roads, Rails and Waterways</i> ; ATHEARN (ed.) <i>Soldier in the West</i> ; WALTERS, <i>Albert Gallatin</i> ; WRIGHT, <i>Washington</i> ; PERKINS, <i>The American Way</i> by A. Conway .. .. .	271
Short Notices .. .. .	274

## ASIA

Indian Historical Records Commission, <i>Proceedings</i> by K. A. Ballhatchet .. .. .	275
SKINNER, <i>Chinese Society in Thailand</i> by D. G. E. Hall .. .. .	275
VELLA, <i>Siam under Rama III</i> by D. G. E. Hall .. .. .	276
Short Notice .. .. .	277

## GENERAL

MULLOY (ed.), <i>Dawson: Dynamics of World History</i> by A. R. Burn .. .. .	277
--	-----

# Contoura

## VERSATILITY

### is what You need

## PHOTOCOPIES anything-

best of all for periodicals, books, papers in files, etc.

CONSTAT PROCESSORS  
£20 (9"), £27 (14")

CONTOURA  
PHOTOCOPIERS £12 to £42

CONTOURA PHOTOCOPYING LTD

56 Islington Park St., London, N.1  
(Canonbury 7900)



---

# THE PLACE OF HERODOTUS IN THE HISTORY OF HISTORIOGRAPHY<sup>1</sup>

---

ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO

*University College, London*

i

I HAVE OFTEN FELT rather sorry for Dionysius of Halicarnassus. How embarrassing it must have been for a budding historian to have the father of history as his own fellow-citizen. No wonder that Dionysius left Halicarnassus and emigrated to Rome where the name of Herodotus, if adroitly used, could even become an asset. In Rome Dionysius was wholeheartedly devoted to the memory of his formidable predecessor. Dionysius is in fact the only ancient writer who never said anything unpleasant about Herodotus. Yet even he never dared to defend Herodotus from the most serious accusation of his enemies, the accusation of being a liar. To us it may perhaps seem odd that the ancients saw nothing incongruous in being at one and the same time the father of history and a liar. But, as far as I know, Francesco Petrarca was the first to notice the implicit contradiction between these two terms and to object to it.

Petrarch had never seen a manuscript of Herodotus, nor would it have made a great difference to him if he had: he never got beyond the most rudimentary knowledge of Greek. But he read most carefully what his Romans told him about the Greeks and was struck by what Cicero said about Herodotus. In the same sentence of *De Legibus* I, 5 Cicero refers to Herodotus as 'the father of history' and brackets him with Theopompus as another notorious liar: 'quamquam et apud Herodotum patrem historiæ et apud Theopompum sunt innumerabiles fabulæ'. This indeed, as Petrarch noticed, was not the only occasion on which Cicero treated Herodotus as a liar, 'fabulosus'. In a passage of *De Divinatione* (II, 116) Cicero expressed the suspicion that Herodotus himself had fabricated and attributed to Delphi the ambiguous oracle about the results of the war between Cræsus and Cyrus. In the same way, Cicero added, Ennius must have fabricated the story of the ambiguous Delphic oracle that encouraged Pyrrhus to march against

<sup>1</sup> A summary of this paper is to be printed in the *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* (Report on the Anglo-American Conference of Historians, July 1957).

the Romans. Petrarch was shocked by the suggestion that the father of history could be the author of a forgery. There was no harm in attributing an oracle to the imagination of Ennius. A poet, Petrarch knew, had a right to invent—not so the father of history. ‘Itaque satis credi potest hoc ab Ennio suo quodam iure fictum esse. De Herodoto autem, quem Cicero ipse patrem historiæ vocat, quod superioris oraculi factor extiterit, non tam facile crediderim.’

This passage of the *Rerum Memorandarum* (IV, 25–6) is typical of Petrarch’s shrewd, yet naïve, understanding of the classical world. If he had been able to read Greek, he would have seen that Cicero was simply conforming to a traditional opinion about Herodotus. Herodotus was not denied the place of ‘primus inventor’ of history, but at the same time was distrusted to the point of being considered a liar.

Admittedly, the Greeks and Romans were not apt to kneel in silent adoration before their own classical writers. Historians were especially open to accusations of dishonesty. But no other writer was so severely criticized as Herodotus. His bad reputation in the ancient world is something exceptional that requires explanation. It does so the more because the ancient opinion had a considerable influence on Herodotus’ reputation among students of ancient history from the fifteenth century to our own times. The story of Herodotus’ posthumous struggle against his detractors is an important chapter in the history of historical thought: it is also, in my opinion, an important clue to the understanding of Herodotus himself.

## ii

Herodotus combined two types of historical research. He enquired about the Persian war—an event of one generation earlier—and he travelled in the East to collect information about present conditions and past events in those countries. The combination of two such tasks would be difficult for any man at any time. It was particularly difficult for a historian who had to work in Greece during the fifth century B.C. When Herodotus worked on Greek history, he had very few written documents to rely upon: Greek history was as yet mainly transmitted by oral tradition. When he travelled to the East, he found any amount of written evidence, but he had not been trained to read it.

Let us say immediately that Herodotus was successful in his enterprise. We have now collected enough evidence to be able to say that he can be trusted. Curiously enough we are in a better position to judge him as an historian of the East than as historian of the Persian Wars. In the last century Orientalists have scrutinized Herodotus with the help of archæology and with the knowledge of languages that he could not understand. They have ascertained that he described truthfully what he saw and reported honestly what he heard. Where he went wrong, either his informants misled him or he had misunderstood in good faith



what he was told. We are not so well placed for the history of the Persian Wars because Herodotus himself remains our main source. Wherever we happen to be able to check him with the help of inscriptions or of simple topography, we have no reason to be dissatisfied with him. This, however, does not mean that we are in a position to say how Herodotus wrote his history. We do not yet know exactly how he proceeded in his enquiry, compared different versions, wrote down his notes, gave them their present literary form. Above all we cannot say how much he owed to earlier writers. But we know enough about Herodotus' alleged predecessors—Cadmus of Miletus, Hecataeus, Dionysius of Miletus, Charon of Lampsacus, Xanthus of Sardes—to state confidently that they did not do the work for him. There was no Herodotus before Herodotus.

The almost total loss of the geographical and ethnographical literature that preceded and accompanied Herodotus' work makes it impossible for us to assess exactly how much he owed to earlier and contemporary writers. But any careful reader of his work will agree that his main research must have been done not on written, but on oral tradition. After all, Herodotus himself tells us that he used *ὄψις*, *γνώμη* and *ἱστορία*: his eyes, his judgement and his talent for enquiry. This can be confirmed by an analysis of the main episodes of the Persian wars. It is easy to see that what he knows about Thermopylae chiefly comes from Sparta, whereas Athenian traditions are behind his accounts of Marathon, Salamis and Plataea.

In other words Herodotus managed to produce a very respectable history mainly on the basis of sightseeing and oral tradition. He succeeded in putting together a trustworthy account of events he was too young to have witnessed and of countries whose languages he did not understand. We know that his history is respectable because we are now able to check it against independent evidence. But we must admit that if we had to give an *a priori* estimate of the chances of success in writing history by Herodotus' method, we should probably shake our heads in sheer despondency. Herodotus' success in touring the world and handling oral traditions is something exceptional by any standard—something that we are not yet in a position to explain fully. The secrets of his workshop are not yet all out. Therefore we cannot be surprised if the ancients found it difficult to trust an author who had worked on such a basis as Herodotus.

It is only too obvious that Thucydides ultimately determined the verdict of antiquity on his predecessor. He carefully read (or listened to) his Herodotus and decided that the Herodotean approach to history was unsafe. To write serious history, one had to be a contemporary of the events under discussion and one had to be able to understand what people were saying. Serious history—according to Thucydides—was not concerned with the past, but with the present; it could not be concerned with distant countries, but only with those places in which

you lived and with those people whose thoughts you could put into your own words without difficulty. Thucydides did not believe that there was a future in Herodotus' attempt to describe events he had not witnessed and to tell the story of men whose language he could not understand. We now know that Thucydides was insensitive to Herodotus' bold attempt to open up the gates of the past and of foreign countries to historical research. But we must recognize that he knew what he was doing in criticizing Herodotus. He was setting up stricter standards of historical reliability, even at the risk of confining history to a narrow patch of contemporary events. Thucydides claimed that an historian must personally vouch for what he tells. He allowed only a limited amount of inferences from present facts to events of the past. He also implied that it is easier to understand political actions than any other type of action. With Thucydides history became primarily political history and was confined to contemporary events.

Now Thucydides certainly did not succeed in imposing his strict standards of historical reliability on other historians, but he succeeded in discouraging the idea that one could do real research about the past. Greek and Roman historians in fact, after Herodotus, did very little research into the past and relatively seldom undertook to collect first-hand evidence about foreign countries. They concentrated on contemporary history or summarized and reinterpreted the work of former historians. Search for unknown facts about the past was left to antiquarians, and the work of the antiquarians hardly influenced the historians. It can be doubted whether Polybius studied Aristotle's constitutions or whether Livy ever read his Varro thoroughly. Indeed, the very existence of the antiquarians was conditioned by the fact that historians interested themselves only in a small sector of what nowadays we should call history. Every generalization of this kind is bound to do violence to a certain number of facts. But on the whole it is apparent that the great historians of antiquity left their mark either on first-hand accounts of contemporary events or on the reinterpretation of facts already collected by previous historians. Xenophon, Theopompus, Hieronymus of Cardia, Polybius, Sallust were pre-eminently historians of their own time. Ephorus, Livy and Tacitus are at different levels to be considered original historians only in so far as they reinterpreted facts which previous historians had collected. The surviving books of Tacitus' *Annals* are the most conspicuous example of a great work of history written with a minimum amount of independent research. And Tacitus himself is an example of what can happen to an historian who relies on interpretation rather than on research: if he is not wrong in his facts, he is liable to be arbitrary in his explanations.

Ancient historiography never overcame the limitations imposed by what we can call the paramouncy of contemporary history. The more remote the past, the less likely historians were to contribute anything new to the knowledge of it. Ephorus and Livy were honest men. They

were by no means deprived of critical sense. Ephorus decided that it was no use trying to tell the story of the Greeks before the Dorian invasion. Livy was acutely aware of the legendary character of the traditions he was bound to follow about the early history of Rome. But neither of them knew how to go beyond the literary sources for an independent enquiry about the past.

Thus Thucydides imposed the idea that contemporary political history was the only serious history; and Herodotus was cut off from the stream of ancient historiography. He was neither a contemporary nor a political historian. His tales, however attractive, looked oddly unprofessional. Even those who liked him as a patriotic and pleasant writer could hardly defend him as a reliable historian. Herodotus invited awkward questions: how could he tell so much about events he had never seen and about people whose language he did not know and whose countries he had only visited for a short time, if at all? *Either* he had concealed his sources, and was a plagiarist, *or* he had invented his facts and was a liar. The dilemma dominated ancient criticism of Herodotus. There was not a very great choice of predecessors, as we know, from whom he could have stolen his facts, but some could be found. A few were authentic enough: the geographer Hecataeus, the mythographer Acusilaus, the genealogist Pherekydes of Athens, perhaps also Xanthus the historian of Lydia, and Dionysius of Miletus the historian of Persia. Others were late forgers, but were accepted as authentic archaic writers by the majority of ancient critics: for instance the alleged first historian Cadmus of Miletus. Furthermore there were genuine historians whom Hellenistic scholarship placed before Herodotus, whereas some at least of the most authoritative modern scholars incline to take them for his younger contemporaries. To mention only the best instance, F. Jacoby has given very cogent reasons for dating Charon of Lampsacus not in the middle but at the end of the fifth century.<sup>2</sup> All these historians counted in the eyes of ancient scholars as potential sources of Herodotus and were made to contribute to the case for Herodotus' plagiarism. But even with the help of writers who were later than Herodotus and therefore may have used him, rather than having been used by him, the case for plagiarism can never have been a very impressive one. Many of Herodotus' enemies seem to have preferred the alternative line of attack which was to present him as a liar. It was obviously easier to dismiss his evidence than to trace his sources. After all, he could not have been considered the father of history if it had been so evident that he had copied from his predecessors. Though we shall see that there were books on Herodotus as a plagiarist, the final impression left by the ancient criticisms of Herodotus is that he was a story-teller—a liar. Here again we can measure the impact of Thucydides' verdict on his predecessor.

<sup>2</sup> *Abhandlungen zur Griechischen Geschichtschreibung*, 1956, p. 178.



## iii

Herodotus had hardly ceased writing his history when Thucydides began to reflect on the mistakes and shortcomings of his predecessor. A few decades after Thucydides, Ctesias launched another attack against Herodotus by questioning his competence both as a student of Greek history and as an historian of the East. Ctesias had all the external qualifications for checking Herodotus' results. He had lived several years at the Persian court and must have understood Persian. He had opportunities of access to Persian records certainly denied to Herodotus. The impact of Ctesias' attack was somewhat reduced by its very violence and extravagance. An historian who puts the battle of Plataea before Salamis in order to impress on his readers his independence from the despised predecessor is likely to get himself into trouble. People were not slow to realize that Ctesias was no less open to suspicion than Herodotus. But, as we know, conflicting suspicions do not cancel each other out. Herodotus' reputation remained tarnished. Paradoxically, he was often associated with Ctesias as an unreliable historian. Even Aristotle went out of his way to denounce Herodotus' mistakes over small details of natural history; and he formulated his criticism in such terms as to involve the reliability of the whole of Herodotus' history. He calls Herodotus a 'story-teller'.

The expedition of Alexander the Great, by opening up the East, certainly revealed lacunæ in Herodotus' information. Strabo in his *Geography* repeatedly echoes and makes his own the criticisms of Alexandrian scholarship. Meanwhile, the Orientals themselves were being Hellenized. They learnt to read what the Greeks had written about them in former centuries and, not unnaturally, found it unsatisfactory. Manetho, the Egyptian priest who tried to present the history of his people to the Greeks, also wrote a pamphlet against Herodotus. The Greeks themselves became increasingly impatient with Herodotus for patriotic reasons. What may seem to us the wonderful serenity and sense of humour of Herodotus in judging the issues between Greeks and Barbarians was for them evidence that the historian had been 'a friend of the barbarians'. Even the local patriotism of Hellenistic Greeks operated against his reputation. Local historians and antiquarians were glad to show him up: he had not said enough about the glories of their own cities. All the anti-Herodotean literature of the Hellenistic age is unfortunately lost, but Plutarch's *De Herodoti Malignitate* can give us some idea of the complaints that were lodged against the father of history. Plutarch puts together a series of criticisms against Herodotus: excessive sympathy for the barbarians, partiality for Athens, gross unfairness towards the other Greek cities, lack of truthfulness where facts are concerned and lack of balance where judgements are involved. History was a form of encomium to Plutarch, and evidently Herodotus did not fit into the pattern. It is a pity that nobody has yet

produced a competent commentary on Plutarch's pamphlet against Herodotus, both because it is typical of the way in which late Greeks looked at their past and because it influenced the judgement about Herodotus of many classical scholars from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century. Plutarch does not seem to have said the worst about Herodotus. To guess from the titles of lost works, even worse was in store for the father of history. Titles such as 'On Herodotus' thefts' by Valerius Pollio or 'On Herodotus' lies' by Ælius Harpocration—not to speak of the book by Libanius 'Against Herodotus'—seem to imply that there was no dishonesty of which he was not capable.<sup>3</sup>

With all that, Herodotus remained a classic. The immaculate grace of his style defied criticism. His information about Oriental countries was more easily criticized than replaced. Notwithstanding Manetho and Berossus, he remained the standard authority on Egypt and Babylonia. His epic tale of the Persian wars was a unique document of the Greek past. The accusation of lack of patriotism could hardly pass unchallenged. We can easily draw up a list of admirers of Herodotus. Theopompus summarized him in two books. No less a critic than Aristarchus wrote a commentary on him. The discovery of a fragment of this commentary has been enough to dispose of the legend that Herodotus was almost forgotten in the Hellenistic age. From the first century B.C. to the late second century A.D. Herodotus was in special favour as a model of style. Archaism operated in his favour. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Arrian and Lucian were his champions. Dionysius says, 'If we take up his book, we are filled with admiration till the last syllable and always seek for more.' What more splendid compliment could Herodotus desire? Lucian is no less enthusiastic: 'If only we could imitate Herodotus—not all his good qualities because this is beyond hope—but at least one of them.'<sup>4</sup>

Yet there are very disturbing features in these apologies for Herodotus. Dionysius does not argue that Herodotus is a reliable historian: he compares him with Thucydides and gives reasons for the superiority of Herodotus that can persuade only those who do not care for reliability in a history. According to Dionysius, Herodotus chose a better subject than Thucydides, because he told the glories and not the misfortunes of the Greeks. He gave his history a better beginning and a better end. He wrote up his subject in a more interesting way and he arranged his materials better. In points of style he can at least compete with Thucydides. If Thucydides is more concise, Herodotus is more vivid; if Thucydides is more robust, Herodotus is more graceful. Herodotus' beauty is 'radiant', where Thucydides' is awe-inspiring. All is in favour of Herodotus—except truth.

In the same way Lucian admires him without ever implying that he is a reliable historian. Indeed Lucian positively denies that Herodotus

<sup>3</sup> Details in W. Schmid, *Geschichte der griech. Literatur* II, 1934, pp. 665–70.

<sup>4</sup> Dionysius, *Letter to Pompeius*, 3, ed. W. Rhys Roberts; Lucian, *Herodotus* (21), 1.

is trustworthy. At least twice he couples him with Ctesias as one of the historians who are notorious liars. In the pamphlet of 'How to write history' (*Quomodo sit historia conscribenda*) Lucian definitely presents Thucydides as the model of the fearless, incorruptible, free, sincere and truthful historian. He emphasizes the fact that Thucydides developed his rules for the historian after having observed what Herodotus had done (41-2). Those who speak about Dionysius and Lucian as the great champions of Herodotus in Antiquity too often forget to add that Dionysius implicitly and Lucian explicitly deny his truthfulness.

## iv

It is my submission that all this resulted from the fact that Herodotus had dared to write a kind of history of which Thucydides disapproved and which later historians found remote and uncongenial. The legend of Herodotus the liar is the result of the authentic achievements of Herodotus the historian. But it will have been observed that if Thucydides disapproved of writing on the past, he did not challenge Herodotus' assumption that history can be written from oral tradition. In the circumstances of the fifth century it was hardly possible to think otherwise. At least in Greece there were not enough written documents to make a sufficiently broad basis for history. Thucydides was far from being blind to the possibilities offered by the exploitation of written documents. Indeed he was one of the very few ancient historians to use written diplomatic records. But it could never occur to him that written records were the primary source for history: if he had thought so, he would never have written the history of the Peloponnesian War. More remarkable is the fact that later historians never tried to modify an approach that had originally been dictated by the conditions of fifth-century Greece. In Hellenistic Egypt there would have been an embarrassing wealth of written records to exploit; and written records were certainly not scarce in Rome during the late Republic and the Empire. But the study of written records remained to the end an exceptional occupation for the Greek and Roman historians. If Thucydides dictated the paramouncy of contemporary history, Herodotus determined the paramouncy of oral evidence. This explains why, though discredited, he remained the father of history.

The pre-eminence of personal observation and oral evidence lasted until historians decided to go to the Record Office. Familiarity with the Record Office, as we all know, is a recently acquired habit for the historian, hardly older than a century. It is true that the Roman and Greek antiquarians knew something about the use of documents and that the antiquarians of the Renaissance perfected this approach to the past. But this method became really effective and universally accepted only a hundred years ago. The antiquarians began to study systematically the records of the past in the fifteenth century, but only in the



eighteenth century did the barriers between antiquarianism and history break down, and only in the nineteenth did it become established practice for the historian to look for new evidence before writing new books of history. The historians continued to compile ancient literary sources and medieval chronicles long after Spanheim, Maffei and Mabillon had worked out the proper method of studying coins, inscriptions and medieval charters. Gibbon was perhaps the first historian concerned with the classical world to pay attention to the results of antiquarian studies. He used the results of antiquarian labour; but even Gibbon made very little independent research in the fields of numismatics, epigraphy and archæology. The documentary or antiquarian approach to the past is now so integral a part of historical studies that we sometimes forget that Mommsen was the first Roman historian systematically to use inscriptions and coins. Not until Rostovtzeff did archæology come into its own for the history of the Roman empire. I am old enough to have witnessed the surprise caused by Rostovtzeff's mastery of archæological data for historical purposes.

The antiquarian or documentary approach to history has been the most effective way of dealing with Thucydides' objection against a history of the past. We may indulge in the illusion that if Thucydides were to come back to life he would not reject our methods with the contempt with which he rejected the method of Herodotus. The labours of the antiquarians between the fifteenth and the nineteenth centuries prepared the way for an approach to the past that effectively undermined the paramouncy of contemporary history. By excavating sites, searching the files of the Record Office, comparing coins, reading inscriptions and papyri, we have gone into the past with the same confidence with which Thucydides and his informants went about the assembly places of contemporary Sparta and Athens. We can collect reliable facts without being eyewitnesses in the Thucydidean sense. In unguarded moments of pride we may even be tempted to tell Thucydides that we know more about Athenian tribute lists than he ever did.

It would however be a great mistake of historical perspective to believe that the documentary approach to history has been the only way in which modern historiography has overcome the limitations imposed by Thucydides on ancient historiography. Before the study of documentary and archæological evidence became a generalized practice, there was a revival of the Herodotean attempt to get into the past by way of enquiries founded on travels and the study of oral tradition. Defeated in antiquity, Herodotus triumphed in the sixteenth century. The revival of the Herodotean approach to the past, which happened then, is the first contribution of modern historiography to an independent study of the past.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Cf. my paper *Erodoto e la Storiografia Moderna*, 'Ævum' 31, 1957, pp. 74-84 for other details.

In the sixteenth century historians travelled once more in foreign countries, questioned local people, went back from the present to the past by collecting oral traditions. In some cases they acted as ambassadors, in others they were missionaries and explorers: they were seldom professional historians. But they wrote history—a history extraordinarily reminiscent of Herodotus both in style and in method. The new diplomacy required careful examination of the traditions of foreign countries; religious propaganda made urgent the production of objective accounts of the peoples to be converted. Above all, there was the discovery of America with all that it implied. There is no need to assume that the Italian diplomats and Spanish missionaries who worked on their ‘relazioni’ or ‘relaciones’ were under the influence of Herodotus. Some of these writers—like Pietro Martire and Francisco López de Gómara—had had a good classical education; others, like Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo, had the reputation of hardly knowing what Latin was. As the historical approach is approximately the same in all of them, it is evident that classical models counted far less than direct experience and contemporary needs. The influence of Herodotus and other classical scholars may colour some details, but the ‘relazioni’ as a whole are certainly independent of classical models. What matters to us is that they vindicated Herodotus, because they showed that one could travel abroad, tell strange stories, enquire into past events, without necessarily being a liar. One of the standard objections against Herodotus had been that his tales were incredible. But now the study of foreign countries and the discovery of America revealed customs even more extraordinary than those described by Herodotus.

Classical scholars soon became aware of the implications of these discoveries. They were delighted to find the New World a witness in favour of the classical authors. As I recently wrote in another context, one of the consequences of the discovery of the New World was to confirm classical scholars in their belief that the perfect ancient world had been perfectly described by perfect ancient authors. If Herodotus did not inspire the students of America, students of America and other foreign countries inspired the defenders of Herodotus. He regained his reputation during the sixteenth century.

My theory that Herodotus recovered from Thucydides’ attack only after two thousand years in the sixteenth century can be proved both positively and negatively. I shall show that in the fifteenth century the old suspicions about him revived, but that in the sixteenth century his reputation improved considerably as a result of the new interest in ethnography.

I must admit that in order to dramatize the rôle of America I have so far underrated the part of Turkey in this development. The emergence of the Turks is another factor that must be taken into account in the story of the fortunes and misfortunes of Herodotus. What happened to Herodotus in Byzantine civilization is beyond my com-

petence. But in the last century of the Byzantine empire the story of the old struggle between the Greeks and the Persians acquired a new poignancy. The Turks had replaced the Persians. Herodotus contained a tale of glory that could be a consolation in the present mortal predicament; but he seems to have been appreciated especially because in his quiet way he had understood the Persians, and through him the Turks could be seen more objectively. An understanding of the approaching masters was perhaps more needed in that situation than celebration of past victories. The last great historian of Byzantium, Laonicus Chalcocondyles, was a student and imitator of Herodotus. It is impressive to see how he described the contemporary world from London to Baghdad in Herodotean terms. He was either the brother or the cousin of one of the Byzantine masters of the Italian humanists, Demetrius Chalcocondyles, and there can be no doubt that he was one of those who directly or indirectly transmitted interest and admiration for Herodotus to the Italian scholars of the first half of the fifteenth century.

The first reaction of the West to the rediscovery of Herodotus was indeed one of sheer delight, as it well ought to have been. Guarino, who translated the first 71 chapters of Herodotus about 1416, repeatedly expressed his joy in reading him. About 1452 Lorenzo Valla translated him entirely; though his translation was not printed until 1474, it made an impression even when it was only in manuscript. Not much later, about 1460, Mattia Palmieri Pisano produced another complete translation into Latin which was never printed. It can be read in an elegant manuscript of the University Library of Turin and contains a most significant eulogy of Herodotus. The father of history is appreciated not only for his style, but also for his method of working, for his journeys, for his free and independent mind.

But the Italian humanists, while learning to read Herodotus, were also learning to know his ancient critics. They realized that Thucydides had attacked him, knew of course Cicero's dubious compliments by heart, got to know what Aristotle, Strabo and Diodorus had said: above all they were impressed by Plutarch's systematic and ruthless attack. On top of all that, religious and scholarly controversies troubled the relations between the Italian humanists and their unfortunate Byzantine colleagues. The Greek name became disreputable again in many humanistic minds; and the psychological resistance to the belief that Herodotus had been a liar decreased correspondingly. The change in the situation is already clear about 1460. Giovanni Pontano was asked to write a preface for an edition of Valla's translation of Herodotus that did not materialize. We have this preface. We can see how prudent and reserved Pontano has become. He defends Herodotus, but he knows only too well that there is an old and impressive case against him. Ultimately he admits that in judging Herodotus one must keep in mind that when he wrote the standards of truth were not so strict as in



modern times. A generation later, Ludovicus Vives had no difficulty in saying plainly that Herodotus deserved the title of father of lies rather than that of father of history, 'Herodotus quem verius mendaciorum patrem dixeris quam quomodo illum vocant nonnulli, parentem historiæ'.<sup>6</sup> The very fact that each translator and editor of Herodotus felt it necessary to defend him against Thucydides and Plutarch shows that at the beginning of the sixteenth century his reputation was, generally speaking, bad.

We can begin to notice a change of attitude in the preface of I. Camerarius to his edition of Herodotus of 1541. The change becomes complete, the defence of Herodotus against traditional accusations becomes confident and aggressive in the *Apologia pro Herodoto* by Henricus Stephanus, first published in 1566. It is an interesting coincidence that the *Apologia* by Stephanus appeared in the year in which Bodin published his *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*. Both Stephanus and Bodin were fighting for a wider historical outlook and had perhaps more points in common than they would have liked to admit. But Bodin could not yet get over the fact that Thucydides, Diodorus and Plutarch had criticized Herodotus so severely. Stephanus, for once the more independent of the two, definitely rejected the judgement of the ancients. Stephanus' main argument is that a comparative study of national customs shows Herodotus to be trustworthy. Here the impact of the modern *relazioni* from distant countries is obvious. What we might call the comparative method of ethnography vindicates Herodotus. This is not the only argument produced by Stephanus. He remarked, for instance, that Herodotus could not be a liar, because he had a religious soul. But the strength of the *Apologia pro Herodoto*—a work of decisive importance in the history of European historiography—lies in its comparison between Herodotus' descriptions and modern customs. As is well known, a few years later Henricus Stephanus used this comparison for satirical purposes in the *Apologie pour Hérodote*, which is no longer a study of Herodotus, but a satire on modern life. We can see the immediate effects of Stephanus' *Apologia* for Herodotus in a book by Loys Le Roy, *De la vicissitude ou variété des choses en l'Univers*, which appeared in 1576. Loys Le Roy, also known as Ludovicus Regius, had long established his reputation as a pupil and a biographer of Budé and as a translator of Aristotle, when he published his meditation on universal history. He deals at length with Mesopotamia, Egypt, Persia, and Greece, and has an almost unlimited faith in Herodotus. Indeed he puts Herodotus and Thucydides together as the best two historians.

If the new ethnographic research was the main factor in the revaluation of Herodotus, the Reformation added a second motive. Interest in Biblical history was revived, independent enquiries were encouraged up to a point. Herodotus proved to be a useful complement to the Bible.

<sup>6</sup> *Libri XII De Disciplinis*, ed. 1612, p. 87.



As David Chytræus put it in 1564, it was providential that Herodotus should begin 'ubi prophetica historia desinit'. In the second part of the sixteenth century a new interest in Greek and Oriental history developed; it encouraged the study of Herodotus and was in its turn encouraged by a greater trust in his honesty. By the end of the century he had been recognized as the indispensable complement to the Bible in the study of Oriental history. This is not to say that the discussion of Herodotus' credibility did not go on well beyond the sixteenth century. There were still fierce controversies on this subject in the eighteenth century. Indeed the discussion is still going on as far as particular sections of his work are concerned. But after Henricus Stephanus there was no longer any question of relegating Herodotus among the story-tellers. He was the master of and the guide to archaic Greek History and Oriental History. As the greatest of the sixteenth-century scholars, Joseph Scaliger, said, Herodotus is 'scrinium originum græcarum et barbararum, auctor a doctis numquam deponendus, a semidoctis et pædagogis et simiolis numquam tractandus'.<sup>7</sup> Scaliger himself made Herodotus one of the corner-stones of ancient chronology. One century later Sir Isaac Newton drew up chronological tables to 'make chronology suit with the course of nature, with astronomy, with sacred history and with Herodotus the father of history'. The course of nature, astronomy, sacred history—Herodotus was now moving in very respectable circles. About the same time, in 1724, the French Jesuit Lafitau discovered with the help of Herodotus a matriarchal society in America. His *Mœurs des sauvages Amériquains* revealed to the world the simple truth that also the Greeks had once been savages.

The stupendous development of the study of Greek and Oriental history in the last three centuries would never have happened without Herodotus. Trust in Herodotus has been the first condition for the fruitful exploration of our remote past. The people who went to excavate Egypt and Mesopotamia had primarily Herodotus as their guide. But there is something more to Herodotus than this. It is true that professional historians now mainly work on written evidence. But anthropologists, sociologists and students of folklore are doing on oral evidence what to all intents and purposes is historical work. The modern accounts of explorers, anthropologists and sociologists about primitive populations are ultimately an independent development of Herodotus' *historia*. Thus Herodotus is still with us with the full force of his method of studying not only the present, but also the past, on oral evidence. It is a strange truth that Herodotus has really become the father of history only in modern times.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> *Thesaurus temporum Eusebii Pamphili*, 1606, 'Animadversiones', p. 97 (anno 1572).

<sup>8</sup> Compare the excellent paper by H. Strasburger, *Herodots Zeitrechnung*, 'Historia' 5, 1956, pp. 129-61.

---

# GEORGE III AND THE CONSTITUTION

---

HERBERT BUTTERFIELD

*Peterhouse, Cambridge*

IN THE *Cambridge Review* for 31 October 1930 (pp. 73-4) D. A. Winstanley—long the leading authority in the field—applauded the researches that lay behind Professor Namier's *England in the Age of the American Revolution*. Readers, he said, would now have to 'consider the necessity' of revising the views they had hitherto held about the early years of George III's reign. In regard to certain incidental matters he was prepared to concede the point that 'some revision' would be found to be unavoidable. 'Yet', he added, 'the main outlines of the story and the characters of the actors remain very much as they were before.' Winstanley, in fact, could not accept Professor Namier's leading idea, that George III, far from having a system of his own, had continued the attitude and the practices of George II, the difference between the two kings being 'merely' one of 'emphasis and degree'. His conclusion was that, after all, we need not 'feel called upon to cast all our previous conceptions into the melting pot'.

The topic on which Winstanley was prepared to differ from Professor Namier—this question of an alleged change of system in 1760—was the one which for nearly two hundred years had been the main issue in the controversy over George III. It had now provided the first occasion for applying the methods of 'the structure of politics' to general narrative, an experiment which had produced a considerable disruption in the larger lines of the story. It is true that the new researches tended to reduce the story to disconnected particles, so that doubt has been thrown on the view that Professor Namier meant to provide a different framework for that piece of history with which he was concerned. But he did make some emphatic assertions; and, amongst those of his supporters who claim to stand as his interpreters, some have strongly insisted upon that more general historical revision which Winstanley was unwilling to admit. There has almost been an inclination at times to treat this version as a test of 'orthodoxy' in an historian. Some, moreover, have produced later writings in which the research and the arguments seem somewhat directed to the support of the same historical

revision. Nevertheless, there have been other scholars since 1930 who have evidently shared the misgivings of Winstanley; and very recently, in the new journal, *Renaissance and Modern Studies* (1957), produced by the University of Nottingham, Mr. W. R. Fryer has criticized the Namierite version of the story in greater detail.

The rejection of the view that the early policy of George III involved a change of system (and thereby provoked a constitutional issue) would entail substantial alterations in the broader framework of English political history during a considerable period. Its effect upon our map of the eighteenth century is likely to be magnified, however, by changes which are being made in other parts of the narrative of George III's reign, particularly the treatment of the Rockingham Whigs. Some misgiving has been created by the way in which the followers of the Namier method have been handling the whole problem of 'party' from the very beginning of the eighteenth century. This, again, is a matter which is calculated to produce important displacements in the main lines of our general history. In all these cases there had been need for a revision of the over-simplified diagram which had provided the basis for the work of the Whig historians. And, though revision had been taking place at least from the beginning of the twentieth century, it could be argued that this work still required to be carried further. On the other hand, while obscurantism and rigidity are always a danger, it is a matter of some moment when revisions are carried to the point at which they break down the wider framework of our general narrative.

The student of history, therefore, should have his critical faculties awake, even when he is dealing with works so scholarly, so packed with documentation, as those of Sir Lewis Namier and his followers. It is important to ask, in considering any historical technique, if there is anything in it which tends of itself to elicit a certain kind of answer (and even to produce a certain kind of history) from the documents that are used. It is useful to remember also that, even when all the apparatus of an elaborate science is present, there is still room for the insertion of subjectivity and partisanship—of something which in the present instance might even be called Tory prejudice. One might properly ask whether the historical revisions which are presented to us do not depend in part on a faulty interpretation of the eighteenth-century constitution—too rigid or too royalist a view of what Sir Lewis Namier himself calls our 'mixed form of government'. It is desirable that historical narrative should be broken into atoms and subjected to severe analysis; but all this has to be the prelude to its reassembly. After all the work of analysis has been done, the historian cannot really escape the necessity of surveying the whole situation with something like a statesman's eye, and even embracing a wider range of considerations altogether.



The classical defence of George III was based on the view that this King had rightly set out to rescue the royal authority which, under the earlier Hanoverians, had suffered too great an eclipse. It was argued that 'the Whigs'—whether they were regarded as a 'ministerial combination' or an 'oligarchy'—had cornered the political power, and stolen a march on the rest of the country. They had taken over the prerogatives and the patronage of the Crown for their own uses; and, having captured the seat of authority, they had made their position watertight by the practice of jobbery and corruption. Since the accession of George I, therefore, the king's personal power, and his chances of having a say in matters of policy, in the work of government or in the dispensing of favour, had been reduced far more radically than the men of 1688 had ever contemplated. A king who regarded the Hanoverian succession as sufficiently established—who felt safe on the throne even without an alliance with a political party—might make it his object to alter the distribution of power, and would still not be contravening the 'Revolution principles' to which his family owed their crown. George III could count on pleasing many people in the country if he reaffirmed the royal authority, and disengaged it from the fetters which the oligarchy had put upon it. For the rest, he had only to set his face against political jobbery and corruption, and proclaim his determination to have nothing to do with party distinctions. Such a programme was bound to have a popular ring; and it represented just the policy for procuring the discomfiture of 'the Whigs', for it would sweep their main weapons out of their hands.

As an interpretation of the intentions of George III, this account may be right or wrong. As a diagnosis of the situation of government in 1760 it may be accurate or mistaken. At any rate, the view is not one of those which have merely been fabricated out of the speculations of later historians. The letters of people like Horace Walpole, the writings of men in court circles, the propaganda of the Bute régime, and certain things said later in parliament show that this version of the story was current amongst the people who were living at the time. They show, furthermore, that in fact this was the interpretation then put forward by the very people who were on the side of the King. It happens to be true at the same time that this interpretation was the one which established itself in English historiography from the moment that the serious study of the subject began. It was the one which was also dominant in the higher ranges of scholarship in the early decades of the twentieth century, after the German writer, von Ruville, had staged a big attack on the 'Whig' version of the story. Indeed, it had even prevailed in serious scholarship during the greater part of the intervening period; for George III seems to have been more fortunate than many people in the way in which he was treated by the historians of succeed-

ing generations. First of all, John Adolphus and Robert Bisset, and then John Wilson Croker and Lord Stanhope, came near to turning this defence of the King into a species of orthodoxy. Even 'Whig' writers, like Macaulay and Lecky, often accepted the general reasoning, or reproduced the broad framework of narrative, that have been outlined above. If they managed to turn against George III, this was as a result of the procedures they adopted at the next stage of their argument.

Even at the time of the events in question, however, it had been possible for some people—for a man like Horace Walpole, for example—to approve of George III at the beginning of his reign, and then to revise this opinion at a later date in view of what had happened in the meantime. It would appear that, by the year 1775, Walpole, perhaps for a mixture of public and private reasons, had changed his sympathies, so that in retrospect he almost reversed the ideas he had had in 1760. He came to regard George III as a king who had used the pretence of an attack on the 'Whig oligarchy' as cover for an attempt to revive what was really arbitrary government. George III, he said, might talk about the abolition of party, but he merely meant to break the Whigs and establish the Tories in power—he knew that the Tories would be upholders of the prerogative. Walpole quoted Pitt as saying that before George III had come to the throne, he himself had set out to abolish party distinctions, but not for the purpose of reviving Toryism in the way that this King was doing. And Walpole embodied these later views of his in those *Memoirs* which were to have so great an influence on the historiography of the reign, so great a part in the shaping of the 'Whig' interpretation.

In any case it was possible for later historians—possible indeed for the politicians of the time—to argue that George III, emancipating himself from the 'Whig oligarchy', was *ipso facto* freeing himself (or was really meaning to free himself) from any and every kind of constitutional restraint. As the Victorian age proceeded it became more difficult to sympathize even with the attack on the 'Whig oligarchy', if this meant the reassertion of the authority of the monarch—a policy more strange and uncongenial to the men of 1860 than to those who had flourished a hundred years before. At its extreme, the 'Whig interpretation' ceased to regard the ascendancy of the Pelhams as an objectionably oligarchical system, and assumed that what had existed down to 1760 was the modern order of things, the rule of ministries based on the party-principle. On this view, George III was actually unconstitutional in his behaviour, attempting to overthrow a regularized system of parliamentary government that had already secured recognition. The more extravagant 'Whig historians' also argued that, though George III did not actually introduce the practice of corruption, he was glad to find it in existence, and prolonged its life, because it provided him with the means for establishing his personal power. From the 1860's the

'Whig interpretation' in one or other of its forms was to be found even amongst the more serious and academic writers on the subject; until, in the decade before the First World War, von Ruville in Germany and Winstanley in England brought the earlier 'Tory' interpretation into currency again.

## ii

Sir Lewis Namier and his followers have always seemed to regard themselves as reacting against the 'whig interpretation', though this latter suffered still further setbacks after 1914. They ask us to believe that George III was in no sense an innovator, and that he did not set out to alter the governmental system which he inherited on his succession to the throne. In this they would appear to be conceiving themselves as vindicating George's policy; and they do not seem to realize to what a degree even most of the 'Whig historians' had been prepared to sympathize with the idea of an attack on the 'Whig ascendancy'. They differ, in fact, from the Tories who have defended, as well as from the Whigs who have denounced, the early policy of the reign.

The 'Tory' defence of George III had always had its nuances; and the break which was supposed to have occurred in 1760 had been traced to its own antecedents. Certain threads of continuity, therefore, still linked the new reign with aspects of the previous one. From the first there had been an attempt to discover the genealogy of George III's ideas, and the origin of these had been carried back to the court of George's father, Frederick, the Prince of Wales. Some of the earlier historians had made the point that George II himself had often groaned against his fetters, and had merely been less fortunate than his grandson in his attempts to throw them off. Some historians had noted that, even before 1760, the elder Pitt had objected to the continued proscription of the Tories—that he shared George's antipathy to jobbery, corruption and political connection. On the other hand, it had been signally demonstrated that, though George II might have resented certain restrictions, the royal authority had not by any means been entirely eclipsed during his reign. The talk of utter 'enslavement'—if it was ever intended to be taken literally, which is very doubtful—had been, therefore, extravagantly polemical. Almost a century ago, W. B. Donne put forward the further suggestion that George III had been persuaded to accept an exaggerated view of the degree of subservience to which monarchy had been reduced in his grandfather's time. Some of the earlier historians had distinguished between the fields in which the royal authority had been checked before 1760, and the fields in which it had had free course, even asserting that George II had surrendered power in one region of his activity for the purpose of acquiring liberation in another. At the same time certain more recent historians, including Mr. Fryer, mentioned above, have persisted in the



view that George II had been placed under real constriction by combinations of ministers.

An old era always tends to overlap into the new, and it had long been known that George III, on his accession to the throne, had proposed to carry on with the existing system for the time being. It had been realized that he had found it necessary to move with some care—to tack and trim—in view of the vested interests which his policies would be likely to affect. Even if he greatly disliked having a particular minister—the Duke of Newcastle, for example—there might be conjunctures in which he would be the one to press for the man's continuance in office. He might find it necessary on occasion to play for time, or might choose for a while to accept his present predicament rather than risk falling into something worse.

The first effect of Sir Lewis Namier's narrative—his *England in the Age of the American Revolution*—is to present the reader with a picture of extremely complex detail. But in history, as in the conduct of present-day politics, it is necessary not to lose sight of the great issues—not to be blind to the broader implications of policy. A piece of research may alter the larger lines of our map of the past by uncovering an unsuspected pivotal detail: but this does not mean that it is ever right for the student of history to lose the wood for the sake of the trees. Two powers that are allied against a common enemy may suffer from so many tensions and cross-purposes as to give the impression of subterranean hostility. The counter-movements and cross-currents are not the whole story, however; and the fact that these two powers are allies may be the directing feature of the case. When we come to the year 1760, shall we say that a change of system occurred, though we know that complications will have to be introduced into the story when we examine it in detail? Or shall we pick up the opposite end of the stick and say that there was no change of system—a course not without its dangers, even if we remember that this thesis, too, would always require to be qualified as we studied it more closely?

The answer to the decisive question depends on what George III, Bute and their collaborators had in mind, behind the chaos of contradictions, cross-purposes and tactical moves. It depends on the way they chose to present the matter to the public when opposition confronted them—the shape of the issues on which they decided to fight, decided, that is to say, to divide public opinion in governing circles or in the press. It is in the minds of the men concerned—in the continuity of their reflection and their purposes—that history acquires a coherence and cohesion, instead of presenting a mere chaos of chances and conjunctures, cross-currents and inconsistencies. The story gains meaning only through that framework of ideas and purposes within which men act even when they seem only to be responding casually to circumstances—even when they appear to contradict themselves in retreats or tactical moves. It is a matter of supreme importance, therefore, that

we should use all the evidence available—even the evidence that might seem irrelevant to the ‘structure of politics’—in order to understand the mentality of historical personages. Without this, indeed, we cannot even distinguish which are their purely tactical utterances, and which of their actions represent strategic retreats. Those nineteenth-century historians who comprehended the broader ideas and purposes of the political actors in George III’s reign—who comprehended them perhaps only in a general way and without an adequate sense of the underlying ‘structure of politics’—are hardly likely to have escaped serious error. But they might not be so wild, or so insidiously harmful, in their mistakes as those who give their minds to mechanics and structure, without due regard for presiding ideas and avowed public purposes; and though we may never know the last secrets of mind and motive on any specific occasion, we can often find clues to a man’s general attitude.

The view that George III had no intention of altering the mode of government—in the sense that so many historians from Adolphus to Winstanley had in mind—can only be maintained by means of an argument which Sir Lewis Namier and Mr. Romney Sedgwick seem not to shrink from adopting: the argument, namely, that this King was somewhat chaotic in his intellect, and came to the throne without any framework of ideas and purposes. Yet, because they have the ‘Whig interpretation’ so particularly in mind as the enemy, Sir Lewis Namier and those who follow him seem to set themselves up as, so to speak, the professional defenders of George III. Above all, they never cease to attack the followers of the Duke of Newcastle and the party of the Marquess of Rockingham, in whom, also, they seem determined not to recognize the existence of any serious ideas and purposes. The work of the propagandists, who wrote of the politics of the time in terms of public issues, is slurred over, and, above all, the more theoretical treatises—the writings of men like Edmund Burke who discussed ideas—are repeatedly derided, as though their polemic could have had nothing to do with the things that men were thinking about. Focussing itself so exclusively on the mechanics of political action, the Namier interpretation refuses to see any serious conflict of ideas, any serious political issues, in the events of the years 1760–3, the age of Bute. The troubles of the early years of George III’s reign, says Sir Lewis Namier, were due to little things, to muddles and jealousies, and to ludicrous ironies of circumstance. Mr. Romney Sedgwick dismisses as a mere ‘legend’ the theory of ‘the able attempt of George III to recover the power of the Crown’. He argues that one circumstance alone is sufficient to explain the supposed ‘break’ in the story and the troubles that occurred after 1760. This was the fact that there was now no heir-apparent capable of leading an opposition party—capable of providing such a party with a ground of hope in that he might be expected to succeed to the throne in not too distant a future.

All this means that one must slur over those passages in the documents in which George III is seen to be expressing his impatience with the ministerial system, his contempt for the 'jobbery' of men like Newcastle, his dream of putting an end to corruption and his hatred of that party-edifice which had resulted in the proscription of the Tories. It means sliding heedlessly over those passages in which George III expressed his determination to escape the fate of his grandfather, George II, and his resolution to be unfettered in his choice of ministers.<sup>1</sup> It means, in Mr. J. Brooke's *The Chatham Administration*, the very curious omission of just those passages which showed George III's attachment to a presiding idea—his determination (when he was forming the Chatham ministry) to break the political connections.<sup>2</sup> We are not even without evidence for the thesis that George III did in fact look back to an earlier period—the reign of William III, in particular—and regarded it as offering a better system of relations for the purpose of the monarchy than actually existed in his own time.<sup>3</sup> These later letters would in themselves be insufficient to establish the purposes of George III at the beginning of his reign. But, when put alongside the earlier evidence they do confirm the resulting picture, and they show that—as one would expect—George III did have strong ideas about the government of the country and particularly about the role of the king. Indeed, he held some of them with such consistency, that his attachment to them has been one of the reasons for regarding him as an obstinate man.

<sup>1</sup> The evidence is often to be found in the works of those who apparently repudiate its significance, and the question is that of the weight which is to be attached to it as a 'leakage' of mentality and as an indication of the mental context in which actions are to be judged; e.g. Newcastle to Hardwicke, 10 Aug. 1761 (Namier, *England in the Age of the American Revolution*, p. 336), where Bute is quoted as saying 'that the King had a notion of not being governed, led, or to that effect, by his Minister or Ministers, as the late King had been'; George III to Bute, 23 Oct. 1762 (R. Sedgwick, *Letters from George III to Lord Bute*, p. 150), where the Queen is reported as saying that at this time 'every true lover of his King and Country ought to prepare for battle against those who would fetter their King'; George III to Bute, mid-April 1762, (*ibid.*, p. 93) 'the successor I have long had in my eye to the D[uke] of N[ewcastle] is a man void of his dirty arts who will think of mine and his country's good, not of jobs'; see also my *George III, Lord North and the People*, p. 3, where George III points out that 'the only difference of conduct I adopted was to put an end to those unhappy distinctions of party called Whigs and Tories'—a formula that produces wide repercussions and (when the whole context is considered) obviously does affect relations with the existing Whig system. See also n. 5 below.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. George III to Chatham, beginning of Dec. 1766 (*Chatham Correspondence*, III, 137): 'A contrary conduct would at once overturn the very end proposed at the formation of the present administration; for to rout out the present method of [parties] banding together, can only be obtained by a withstanding their [the Bedford party's] unjust demands, as well as the engaging able men, be their private connections where they will.' (The word 'parties' is omitted in the slightly different transcription from the Windsor MSS. in Fortescue, *Correspondence of King George III*, i. 420.)

<sup>3</sup> George III to Lord North, 12 Feb. 1779, Fortescue, *Correspondence of George III*, IV, 275: 'this Country will never regain a proper tone unless Ministers as in the reign of King William will not mind being now and then in a Minority'. The letter from Lord North to George III of March 1782 (*ibid.*, V, 394-97) clearly regards George III as needing correction in respect of the submission which a British king must make to the vote of the House of Commons, and addresses itself to the question of the precedents set by past monarchs, including William III, as though it was understood that the King was attached to the idea of losing no ground which the earlier eighteenth-century monarchs had held.



In any case, it cannot be denied that, in the circle of Bute, men wrote, from the very beginning of the new reign, on the assumption that a different type of régime was now being set on foot. Some even put it on record at an early date that the primary aim was the dislodgement of the oligarchical Whigs.<sup>4</sup> There are signs that George III and Bute—as well as their immediate entourage—did indeed nourish a dream, and set to work in the mood of men who intend to install a new system.<sup>5</sup> Some of this is further evident in the taunts of the opposition, the form of the counter-attack, and the complaints about the change of language at court. Apart from all this, there is even clear evidence that Bute and his associate Dodington did discuss with one another the issue which the older historians so often regarded as crucial: the question whether, if the King broke with Newcastle, those men who had been advanced through the Duke's control of the royal patronage would stand by their attachment to the King or their gratitude to the Duke. Nothing could provide better evidence of the feeling that the patronage of the Crown had been engrossed by the Whigs, but that perhaps it was not too late to remedy the evil. From the propaganda that was produced on behalf of the court we can learn the issues as they were chosen for presentation to the public: the King's right to the free choice of his own ministers and confidants; the propriety of liberating the royal authority from a ministerial combination and rescuing the country from an aristocratic system; and the question of the desirability of putting an end to corruption on the one hand, proscription on the other. The *Annual Register*, seeking to tell the story impartially as a matter of contemporary history, gives the same picture of the situation. Since it shows how the men of the time envisaged the issue, its evidence is relevant to the particular problem with which we are concerned. It leans to the side of the King but it recognizes the fact that a constitutional issue has been raised between the new régime and the old. All the evidence of this kind is never to be derided or merely skipped; for the historian's narrative has at least to *account for* even the discrepant witness, and the sources on which he does not choose to rely. No matter how much factiousness lay behind the story—no matter how greatly both of the parties to the conflict may have erred in their diagnosis of their own contemporary situation—the thing

<sup>4</sup> See my *George III and the Historians*, pp. 43, 104, 225.

<sup>5</sup> Lord Shelburne, in a 'Memorandum of the Events of 1762' (Fitzmaurice, *Life of Shelburne* (1875) i. 141) says that Bute had 'an idea of great reformatations, which all men who read the theory of things, and especially men who look up at being Ministers . . . make a great part of their conversation'. In an 'Autobiographical Fragment' (*ibid.*, p. 48) he says that George II 'did not choose to try the experiments which his Grandson is about, nor was that time by any means ripe, I believe, for them, though Lord Granville thought otherwise'. Cf. George III to Bute, second half of Nov. 1762 (R. Sedgwick, *op. cit.*, p. 166): 'I own I had flattered myself when peace was once established that my D[ear] Friend would have assisted me in purging out corruption . . . then when we were both dead our memories would have been respected and esteemed to the end of time'; George III to Bute, at about the same date (*ibid.* i. 167), 'the hour comes which has been so long wished for by my D[ear] Friend, I mean the entering on a reformation in Government'.

which men regarded as the grand public issue is bound to be the presiding feature of the case.

## iii

The attempt to deny the reality of the political issues of the earlier years of George III's reign has been assisted by the adoption of too literalistic an interpretation of the rights of the king. Some later writings may have corrected the earlier emphasis on this question; but this does not seem to have affected the Namier interpretation of the opening years of the reign. In any case, one must remember that in the eighteenth century different interpretations of the constitution were in constant conflict; nor is it permissible to assume that the constitution had been finally fixed, without openings for alternative courses of development.

The Revolution of 1688 provided certain safeguards against the arbitrary use of the royal power; but, with these reservations, it was still understood that the king conducted the government and appointed the ministers. His administration could not maintain itself for long without confronting parliament, however; and if there was a sense in which he could choose any man he liked as his minister, there was a sense also in which he was bound to feel that here, as in other acts of policy, his choice was highly conditioned. Even when there were no serious conflicts to divide the country, it made a great difference in the transaction of business if the minister was a man who could work tolerably well with parliament. A technique of government and a *modus vivendi* had to be worked out, and the time might come when a man's ability to manage the house of commons would be a factor in the king's desire to have him as a minister. Striding with one foot in the Closet and one in parliament, the minister could hardly fail to realize the power which this ambiguous situation enabled him to acquire. The fact that he could claim to voice British interests against 'Hanoverian' policies or advisers, and against private confidants of the king in the Closet, would give him further leverage, and provided a different source of tension. A minister might argue—as Townshend and Walpole argued in 1717—that a given policy, which the king desired, would not be acceptable to the house of commons. He might do this when he personally disagreed with the policy and was prepared to assist or even incite the parliamentary opposition that he was pretending to prognosticate.

In the face of parliament ministers could insist on the royal favour which had brought them to office and which kept them in power. They could fall back on the will of the king, which was identified with their policy, so that opposition to their decisions appeared as hostility to the king. In the face of the monarch himself, however, the same men could assert the need to placate the house of commons—they could

refuse to accept responsibility in parliament for a policy of which they did not approve. Sir Lewis Namier and those who accept his interpretation, are inclined to measure the whole situation by taking the ministers—the Duke of Newcastle and others—at their word in the former of these modes of argument, while treating the latter mode as merely tactical and insincere.<sup>6</sup> But if men were merely tactical—were merely reflecting the effect of their situation—in the one case, the same might just as well be true of the other. The remarks are to be construed, not in a literalistic manner, but always with reference to the posture or the platform from which they were delivered. In other words, the historian must penetrate behind them, range over a wider field of evidence, and carry the analysis deeper in his search for the truth.

The supposed right of the king to choose any man as his minister requires to be treated with elasticity of mind. Those who were ministers and those who were only would-be ministers might certainly compete with one another for the royal favour. When this aspect of the matter is considered, the power of the king clearly appears as an important factor in the story. On the other hand, the politicians were able to combine, and they could use the influence that was at their disposal in order to secure strength of their own in the house of commons. They might swear that the king had the right to choose his own ministers—might indeed insist that he do the choosing; but the words might sound like a taunt if they had produced a situation in which it would be catastrophic for him to choose anybody but them. He might be formally free to choose, but they could not be prevented from having a part in the establishment of that network of conditioning circumstances

<sup>6</sup> E.g. *England in the Age of the American Revolution*, p. 401. In the *Sunday Times*, 8 Feb. 1953, Sir Lewis Namier compares C. J. Fox's denial of the King's right to choose his ministers with his eagerness to be appointed by George III's heir, whether as Regent or King. I think that many historians have long agreed with him that this makes the conduct of the Rockinghamites 'less impressive' and indeed more factious. Too often, however, there is the innuendo that, e.g., Fox would be sincere in the latter case (which represented his real or realist policy) but not in the former case which was mere 'programme'—the easy utopianism of ineffectual opposition. It must be remembered that when men, parties and even churches feel that they are in the right and that they ought to be in power, they are ready (as both Catholics and Protestants once were) to accept or seek power at the hands of the monarch without really believing that the monarch had the right to decide, the right to give the power to the other party. And, though Fox certainly was factious, the argument would apply *a fortiori* in a case such as the one quoted, when the real alternative to his holding power at the will of a Regent was his enemies holding power at the will of a King, this system being in operation whether he liked it or not. Fox addressed himself to the same fundamental issue in connection with the parallel case of corruption when it was argued that those out of power opposed corruption while those in power supported its continuance. On 8 Feb. 1780 he called for 'the judgment of Solomon'—let the world see who really was prepared to vote for the abolition of this disowned child, corruption. I do not feel that the Rockinghamites came quite satisfactorily out of the test (from a twentieth-century point of view) though they did set out to trim corruption when they came into office in 1782. However, as Professor Pares points out (*King George III and the Politicians*, p. 90), Burke in 1770 claimed (and George III's complaint to a certain degree confirmed the claim) that the Rockinghamites in office had held to the principles they had adopted in opposition. Too much could be made of this, but the emergence of this point as a criterion is itself not without significance. I long ago wrote (*George III, Lord North and the People*, p. 41) that 'not Rockingham or North or Fox or Grafton served England so faithfully, so nearly without a glance at private purposes or party aggrandisement' as George III; but he was obstinately self-righteous and it can hardly be denied that the opposition to him led to the development of constitutional ideas.



which always constricted his choice. And when he had chosen them, it was natural that they should stress the fact that he had selected them, and should insist on his right of choice.

Though it is true, perhaps, in a formal sense, once again it is not absolutely true that opposition to the ministry in the eighteenth century meant opposition to the king. Those who were out of office might form an opposition-party, and, as Croker explained over a century ago, might assemble themselves around the Prince of Wales, and might have faith that at least they would achieve their advancement when he came to the throne. That faith was itself a precarious one, as the eighteenth century was to show on more than one occasion. Nor is it plausible to argue that under the Hanoverians a man in opposition could never hope to recover favour during the lifetime of the reigning king. This factor in the story has been exaggerated, though it had some significance when George II lived longer than was expected and cheated some men's calculations. It is not at all clear that when a Walpole or a Hardwicke, a Newcastle or a Rockingham, went into opposition they despaired of making themselves acceptable again—or perhaps indispensable—to the existing king.

On the other hand, when a minister lost his office, there was a considerable likelihood that he would go into regular opposition. He would not confess that he opposed the government merely because he was not a member of it, and in this sense we find him constantly taking care to deprecate 'regular opposition'. He would discover that Walpole (for example) ought to be opposed because of the evils or the dangers of the policy he was pursuing. It would hardly be possible to recruit the support of other men in parliament save by making reference to points of misgovernment which one was prepared to specify. On the other hand, such a man would be able to predict in advance that while Walpole was minister ample opportunities would arise for plausible criticism. Newcastle and Hardwicke knew in advance in 1762 that Bute would provide them with what they could claim to be reasonable pretexts for opposition; though when Newcastle thought that the Treaty of Paris met the case, Hardwicke disagreed and said that it would be better to wait for more genuine offences which were bound to come.<sup>7</sup> In certain senses it was possible to oppose not merely the mistakes of ministers but also the alleged scandal of their actual appointment. While the Pelhams were in power one might complain that the hand of the king had been forced by a political combination. When a Carteret or a Bute had the king's confidence, one could cry out against the evils of favouritism and closet influence. If in the one case the argument would be partly sincere and partly tactical, the same would be true in the other case too.

In this situation, it is artificial to speak of the king's rights in a legalistic manner, or to imagine them as existing in a vacuum. If

<sup>7</sup> Yorke, *Hardwicke*, III, 444.

George III did not laudably take a calculated risk in order to free Britain from the dangers of an oligarchical combination, he brought much trouble upon himself and his kingdom by taking too literally his formal right to choose his own confidant and minister. It might even be said that he tried to put into execution the Namier theory of government—a theory based on isolated and specialized considerations. And certainly he had a ‘right’ (in a sense) to try the experiment, provided he was ready to face the music or to take arms against a sea of troubles. But he was wrong if he expected the Namier theory of government to save him from the obvious political consequences of his actions. And some of the very people who were on his side showed their sense of the magnitude of the risk that was being taken. The point is, that a king had to learn by the hard way or by the easy way that there were certain forms of self-assertion that were hardly going to be worth attempting. They provoked too much trouble, made government too inconvenient, brought out the latent conflict in the constitution, and were calculated to limit still further the choices that would be open to the king next time.

This flexible view of the constitution is by no means the invention of the modern historian. The *Annual Register* for 1763 supported David Hume in the opinion that the Stuarts themselves had erred not by extending the prerogative but by failing to see that the time had come for a loosening of the reins. It was prepared to entertain the idea of putting new restrictions on the king—going further than the existing laws actually went—though judging against the necessity of the policy on that immediate occasion. It described the party of Newcastle as objecting to the appointment of Bute not because it was formally illegitimate but because it was against ‘the spirit of the constitution’. Already there were people who were using this formula for the purpose of measuring the letter of the constitution against some notion of its deeper intent.

On this whole issue, let us be clear that, if the principle of monarchy had survived a succession of revolutions, there is no reason to believe that men had forgotten the triumph of Whiggism in the Hanoverian succession. Indeed, amongst the victors of 1688 had been a Whig interpretation of history which was itself based on a kind of constitutional doctrine—the view that liberty and the parliamentary system were coeval with the monarchy, inherent in English history, and never a mere concession from kings. Those who emphasize the quasi-technical rights of the monarch in the eighteenth century must remember also the enormous influence of Locke in what was really a wide realm of thought. It would not be easy in the eighteenth century to lose sight of the fact that in England—and even before the Revolution of 1688—there was something of a tradition of resistance to kings. In England there was nothing to stop the beaten candidate, the would-be minister, from seeking to rouse the house of commons against his successful rival. He could do this if he was ready to brave the king’s displeasure—a

displeasure which (however severely the king might threaten it) would not necessarily prove eternal. And, whatever lip-service men might give to the idea that regular opposition was disloyal, Englishmen by 1760 must have become accustomed to the existence of the phenomenon.

## iv

From the middle of the nineteenth century it was realized that eighteenth-century politics were not to be interpreted in terms of the Victorian two-party system. Certain breaks in continuity had been noted and it had been pointed out, for example, that the Whigs of the age of Rockingham appeared to have borrowed something from the Tory opposition of Walpole's day. It had been seen that the struggle between Whig and Tory had been complicated by another pattern of conflict—the rivalry of political clans or connections, fighting under a lord and recruited from his relatives, his clients and his political associates. All the time, of course, it had been recognized that the distinction between Whig and Tory had been prolonged for factious purposes after it had ceased to be relevant to the situation. It was realized in any case that parties in the eighteenth century differed greatly from those of more recent times, and that these varying types must not be confused or identified with one another. At the same time, Sir Lewis Namier and his followers have made a tremendous advance in our knowledge and appreciation of the non-party elements in the politics of the period, though the existence—and, to a certain degree, the importance—of these (whether independent members of the house of commons or 'King's Friends') had not passed unnoticed.

But the anatomical methods of the Namier school have been producing in various periods of the eighteenth century a serious divergence on the whole subject of party between their view and that of the more comprehensive narrative historians, whether of the past or of the present. The organization of the issues of the time into a straight conflict between Whig and Tory, if it ever existed in a pure form, had been qualified in the course of time, but had still been carried to the point of exaggeration. Now, however, the divorce of the idea of Whig and Tory from what are sometimes regarded as the purely factional conflicts of the time, has tended to become too great, and a number of historians seem to have been uneasy about it. It might be claimed that the mere analysis of 'the structure of politics' is not sufficient for an over-all judgement—that a knowledge of the full political story of the time is necessary for a comprehensive view of the working of the system—that, indeed, the parliamentary debates, in so far as they are recoverable, are important, as well as the division-lists. We might go further and say that all the workings and policies of government offices and departments require to be studied and elucidated before the structure of government itself (as well as the direction of government



action) can be comprehensively surveyed. Perhaps we might even say that, without the full narrative, it is impossible for the student to have a complete view of 'the structure of politics' itself. The Namier form of procedure certainly seems to allow those who adopt it to miss the point of certain imponderables on occasion; and at times its followers tend to overlook anything so vague and cloudy as the Whig consciousness or the Whig tradition—which is a question relating to human minds. In this way one can come to react too violently against the older Whig interpretation of history, reducing the Rockinghamite connection too much to the level of a merely factious combination, or making it too much like the other political groups of the time. Sir Lewis Namier, while rightly insisting on the importance of party in the development of limited monarchy in England, seems at times to under-estimate the effect which the earlier, less adequate, forms of political combination had in the eighteenth century, even before 1760 for example. And he does less than justice to the way in which men had long been consciously striving to achieve a more logical form of party. He does less than justice, also, to the amount of writing and theorizing which was devoted to the problem, and which, even when it purported to attack the idea of party, was really seeking a new form of it that would be more relevant to current issues. Indeed, if we accept his theory concerning the importance of party in the development of limited monarchy, we must regard George III as shrewd in respect of his monarchical interests when he repeatedly expressed his desire to destroy party, whether in the sense of Whig and Tory or in the sense of aristocratic political connection. And, by the same argument, the Rockinghamites were right when they protested that the destruction of these kinds of political combination would enhance the royal power.

It would not be wrong, of course, to describe the government of the earlier Hanoverians as 'Whig'. We must keep our sense of humour and not imagine that the Walpoles and Pelhams had ceased to be Whigs because—having secured a king who was on their side and who conformed to the will of the nation (as they saw it)—they suspended their anti-prerogative teaching, and their reserve doctrine of resistance, desiring first and foremost to make the Hanoverian succession secure. I do not believe that the Walpoles and Hardwicks, the Pelhams and Rockinghams—and that body sometimes designated as 'the old corps'—ever for a moment forgot that they belonged to the great Whig tradition. Horace Walpole could support the government in the days of the early Hanoverians, and could even rejoice to see the Duke of Newcastle overthrown by George III. But the Whig tradition did mean a great deal to him, and, in 1756, he tells us how he keeps at the side of his bed not only *Magna Carta* but also the warrant for Charles I's execution. And this we can take as something more than an infatuation over dead issues and battles long ago. Though the Tories were not likely to bring out prerogative doctrines for the benefit of Hanoverian

kings who were in the pockets of the Whigs, their tradition persisted, perhaps anomalously, in the localities. It seems to have endured in the form of high church prejudice after the religious issue had ceased to be important in parliamentary politics.

Even after 1760 the *Annual Register* showed how the Duke of Newcastle had come to be the head of a body which it simply designated as 'the Whigs'. When the Marquess of Rockingham had succeeded him in the leadership, his papers still described the connection as 'the Whigs', *tout court*. Horace Walpole, in his *Memoirs of the Reign of George III*, repeatedly uses the term 'the Whigs' when it is clear that he is referring to the Rockinghamites. Even if this party had arrogated the title to themselves unfairly, the fact would confirm the view that some association with the Whig tradition was either in their desire or in their consciousness. But when the Duke of Cumberland was negotiating for the establishment of the ministry of 1765, he too spoke of treating not only with Temple and Pitt but also 'with those lords that formed the head of the Whig party'. Newcastle played his part in that negotiation, and meetings were held at his house, though when the arrangement finally took form it was Rockingham who was charged with the conduct of the new administration. Newcastle still retained his connection with the party, however—grumbling when his advice was sometimes ignored—and it would be wrong to suggest that Rockingham now emerged as the new leader of a new party. Some derision has been poured on the idea that the Rockinghamites were '*sui generis* among eighteenth-century parties'; but, if all consciousness of intellectual tradition were drained out of the story, the truth remains that such bodies as the 'Bedford Whigs' were rather like clans and in any case were comparatively diminutive affairs. The party of Newcastle and Rockingham was even structurally different—a confederacy between clans, or between the heads of clans—still conscious, even in 1792, of standing as the representative of the aristocratic interest of the country—but less like a clan and more like a 'party' when a Walpole, instead of a powerful magnate, could have the political leadership of the whole confederacy.

It is possible that the ubiquity of party in the present-day house of commons, the hardness of party organization and the firmness of party discipline have begun to affect the attitude of the historian to eighteenth century parliamentary life. Even within the twentieth century there have been many people who started their thinking on this subject from a different norm, and had misgivings about the growing severity of party discipline, the reduction of freedom and independence, the decline in the rôle of the private member, and the little effect that the course of debate seemed to have on divisions. In 1767 Rockingham's papers show his party as numbering 121, while the Duke of Newcastle put the figure at 101. These two men provide us with lists which, since they were meant for internal use, can hardly have been intended to deceive; yet

they diverge from one another, having 77 names in common, but enumerating a considerable body of men whose attachment must have been doubtful or occasional. It is easy for the historian to say: 'What kind of party was it whose leaders did not know their own followers?' But we must expect just such signs of more primitive structure when we are dealing with an earlier period of history. In fact, it has long been realized that the political connections of the eighteenth century did not possess the solidarity of modern party-organization, and that parliamentary life was less regimented than now. It is only too likely that parties inside parliament in that period—perhaps like parties outside parliament today—would have a broad vague fringe, with some people attached to one leader rather than another, or associated for one type of purpose but not for all. Over a decade after 1767, the band of men around Charles James Fox seemed to be skirmishing only in somewhat loose alliance with the Marquess of Rockingham. We are told that on 17 February 1768, only between 50 and 60 of the men who had been claimed for the party voted for the *Nullum Tempus* Bill, to which Rockingham attached great importance. But if we must not expect the tightness of modern party organization, we must not expect the modern tightness of party discipline in the eighteenth century. Men who 'had close ties with the magnates of the Rockingham party' would certainly fail to follow their chief on occasion; it was notoriously difficult to secure attendance in parliament, and important people might refuse to resist the lure of Newmarket. When we are told that a party leader could not absolutely 'count on the votes of his closest followers' we show how much we have forgotten if we allow ourselves to be too surprised. Furthermore, it is not this—it is the rigidity of modern party discipline that presents the paradox and requires to be explained. The fact that party was so loose a combination—so vague at the edges and so fluid internally—is surely one of the reasons why we must be careful about making hard inferences from statistics and division lists. Two separate accounts (Horace Walpole and the *Parliamentary History*) suggest that, in the case of the *Nullum Tempus* Bill, the actual course of the debate has some relevance in a discussion of the division-lists. And the fact that in 1767 Rockingham could say, while negotiating on behalf of his party, 'that he was responsible to a large body of people for his conduct' may be more significant of the relative standing of his party than the actual figures we possess. We need not accept his words with superstitious credulity; but he was speaking to Grafton who would surely have recognized anything that was obviously foolish. Mr. Brooke, who provides us with these figures and discusses the whole issue in his book on *The Chatham Administration*, has greatly added to our knowledge by his researches and has produced a work that is indispensable to students of this period. But, until further evidence is provided, the outside student might question some of his inferences from the evidence and may doubt whether, on the subject of the Rockinghamites,



he has not carried the reaction against the Whig interpretation too far.

The Duke of Newcastle was not dismissed in 1762; he resigned because he would no longer accept the terms on which he was expected to collaborate with his colleague, Bute. It is sometimes objected that he and Rockingham opposed the King and the government merely because they were out of office; but one can answer that these men and their friends might easily have had office if they had been prepared to accept it at any price. At least we must say that there was some article (or some form) of independence which they felt that they were called upon to sacrifice if they worked with the new régime. On this issue, to be sure, we can wipe them out as merely arrogant or selfish if we have decided beforehand that we will be on the side of the King. Even when Bute was out of office the supporters of Newcastle still directed their hostility against the Favourite's influence (or his possible influence) in the Closet. Later, when the Rockingham ministry was falling in 1766, both its friends and its enemies imputed its weakness to the intransigence which it showed towards Bute's party, the men who were later known as the King's Friends. At the next stage in the story, the dismissal of Rockingham was exactly calculated to raise the issue of Closet intrigues carried on behind the backs of the ministry of the day. Clearly the political developments of the time had brought to an intenser stage the problem that had existed under the earlier Hanoverians—whether in the case of Hanoverian advisers or the case of Carteret in 1746—the question of the confidence which was due from the King to the ministers who were conducting his affairs in parliament. The successive examples of opposition to Bute help us to see why Horace Walpole regarded the party of Newcastle and Rockingham as showing a greater consistency than other parties. The Rockinghamites elaborated their ideas as they opposed the claims of the court in regard to both the appointment and the treatment of ministers. In one form or another they raised the crucial question of the relations between the Closet and the Ministry, a question particularly congenial to men who felt themselves to be in the Whig tradition. It is remarkable to see how early these men had begun to adumbrate—though in a context so unlike our later one—the features of our modern constitution, at least in respect of the position of ministers. In his *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents*, Edmund Burke, in 1770, went to the heart of this particular issue. He conceded that George III might not have broken any laws in this connection, but, using the formula which we have already met at the beginning of the reign, he insisted that the choice of ministers on any but public grounds was against 'the spirit of the constitution'. He also took his stand on the principle of 'party' as such, and made this in itself a further issue with the monarchy; and it is difficult to see why Sir Lewis Namier, who sees the importance of 'party' in the establishment of an effectively limited monarchy, should

be so anxious to deny the contribution of the Rockinghamites to this whole process of development. However technically 'correct' George III may have been in respect to the ministerial problem, surely it will not be argued that it would have been better to leave him without serious opposition—as though it were a misfortune that there existed a body of men who had an alternative view of the direction in which they desired to see the constitution develop.

Horace Walpole takes the line that the two main parties of Whig and Tory went on existing for a few years after George III's accession to the throne. Even in the ensuing confusion of parties, however, he makes a clear dividing-line, and it is interesting to see that he has a guiding principle. He shows that he will regard as 'Tories' the men who support the prerogative or have a leaning towards arbitrary government. He will call them 'Tories' even if they go on calling themselves 'Whigs', and even if, like Lord North they really are Whigs in the more superficial and conventional sense—supporters of the Revolution and the Hanoverian settlement.<sup>8</sup> But, he adds, the men who were on the side of the court, though they never actually disclaimed the title of 'Whig', ceased to call themselves by that term. For Horace Walpole, then, the issues were beginning to sort themselves out again, and a situation was being produced in which political 'connection' might be more reasonably related to political 'principle'. The situation was not as logical as this might suggest, and even in the days of Gilbert and Sullivan the old idea of party based on 'connection' was still anomalously entangled with the idea of party based on principle—for why otherwise should we have had the song about being 'born' a little liberal or a little conservative? And it is not irrelevant to note that, according to Walpole, the Opposition dates back to the resistance that was offered to Bute.

Whether we are dealing with the king's right to choose his ministers, or the state of the constitution (and of contemporary opinions about the constitution) or the supposed inadmissibility of regular opposition, or the alleged non-existence of party, other than selfish faction, it is necessary that we should not allow any inflexibility of mind, any literalness of interpretation, to take away the importance of the problems provoked by the régime of Bute, or to argue that the constitutional issue was illegitimate, or—even if it was illegitimate—to pretend that it did not exist in the controversies of the time. It is not clear that

<sup>8</sup> Sir Lewis Namier, in *Personalities and Powers*, p. 33, asserts that Horace Walpole, when he called North a 'Tory' (in a footnote added in the 1780's), was merely resorting to 'current cant'. One would like to see him write more fully upon the whole passage to which this footnote is appended; for Walpole had been describing how, though few real Tories had been admitted into place, a number of people who called themselves Whigs had gone over to Bute's prerogative doctrines. Under Lord North, he says, 'the Court's system of prerogative predominated entirely'. It is not clear that Sir Lewis Namier, in his talk of 'current cant', is not under-estimating the genuineness of the Whig tradition in Walpole and the possible authenticity of a certain 'Whiggish' attitude to the régime of North. Also he omits the fact that Walpole had just declared the system of Whig party versus Tory party to have dissolved, so that there was room for the new division which he was trying to make on a point of principle. [See H. Walpole, *Memoirs of the Reign of King George III* (1894), Vol. II, p. 66.]

the historical method which has been described as 'counting the cabbage-patches in Ohio' (though it has much utility in its own more obvious sphere) has not—by a certain literalism and unimaginativeness—carried us further from the truth. It neglects the importance of constituencies like those of the metropolitan area, where public opinion had its place in political life; underrates the significance of appeals to extra-parliamentary opinion, such as are seen even in the age of *The Craftsman*; shows too little regard for the attempts which were made even before 1760 to measure the house of commons against at least the presumed rights and opinions of constituents; and fails to trace the whole story of the development of political consciousness in the nation at large. Like the Whig tradition, these things are sieved away, as 'imponderables' by the Namier technique, and with them disappears that whole aspect of politics which addresses itself to public opinion, and which certainly the *Annual Register* would hardly have recorded if it had not been there.



---

## HISTORY BOOKS FOR SCHOOLS: IV

---

W. J. FOWLER

*Bedlington Grammar School, Northumberland*

FROM THE PRESENT SELECTION of books for review it seems that the emphasis in this field continues to be largely on auxiliary books and material rather than on general textbooks, a characteristic noted by the writer of the first article in this series.<sup>1</sup> There are, however, outstanding exceptions to the general trend this time. The famous 'Meiklejohn',<sup>2</sup> first published in 1890, has been largely rewritten and now appears in a jubilee edition, and R. M. Rayner's *Short and Concise Histories*,<sup>3</sup> first published in the 1930's, are now available in complete and extended versions. These publications provide an opportunity to consider further Mr. Whitting's question, in the article referred to above, whether this style of textbook, although 'perhaps not exactly what is now required', has been adequately replaced, and to consider also why they are still widely used.

The editors of 'Meiklejohn' state that 'there is still a great demand for this type of concise political history', and the unaltered original preface to Rayner's *Concise History* supplies a reason for this demand in the assurance that 'a boy or girl who has mastered the facts and ideas here presented . . . should be able to tackle any School Certificate [*sic*] paper with confidence'. A factual knowledge of political history is still the surest way to success in public examinations, and examiners regularly deplore the poor answers to social and economic questions and papers; but it is not suggested that this is the sole or even the main reason for the continued popularity of such books, which, even in these new versions, are not quite in line with contemporary views, as succeeding paragraphs will suggest. There are reasons arising from

<sup>1</sup> *History*, vol. XLII, no. 144, p. 81.

<sup>2</sup> *A Short History of England*. By Prof. J. M. D. Meiklejohn, revised by K. J. Revell and G. R. Cross. 50th edition. Meiklejohn. 1957. ix + 242 pp. Maps. 6s. 6d.

<sup>3</sup> *A Short History of Britain*. By R. M. Rayner, with additional chapters to 1955 edition by A. D. Ellis. New complete edition. Longmans. 1957. xxii + 562 pp. Many illustrations. 16s. 6d.

*A Short History of Britain, 1714-1955*. By R. M. Rayner, with additional chapters by A. D. Ellis. Longmans. 1957.

*A Concise History of Britain*. By R. M. Rayner, with additional chapters by A. D. Ellis. Complete edition in one volume. Longmans. 1956. xxiv + 713 pp. Maps, notes and examination questions. 21s.

the economics of the publishing industry; there is a conservatism in syllabus form and content that can come too easily to those of us who were brought up before 'lines of development', 'projects' and 'patches' were fashionable; there is a well-founded belief that History as a study and a discipline cannot be appreciated without a firm chronological backbone, best acquired through a basically political approach. However, use of a particular textbook does not mean that the pupil is limited to material between its covers, and ultimately the way in which the tangled and variegated texture of the Past is presented depends on the teacher, who may anyhow regard his textbook as a poor substitute for the ideal work which he will never write.

'The Meiklejohn' is an unambiguous statement of English History as we have learnt it, and within its limits in line with modern work. The most ardent prehistorian can hardly quarrel with the opening sentence: 'The history of Britain before the Romans came is the story of successive invasions by groups of people from the European mainland'—though he may quibble about the word 'invasion'; while the disciple of Namier will surely approve of the succinct statement of George III's aims (p. 149). Most of the familiar stories are here; the first Prince of Wales, Mary and Calais, and the like, but not Alfred and the Cakes: there are deceptively simple judgements like that on Richard II, who 'was aiming at an unchecked despotism'. It is in the treatment of the latest centuries that there is perhaps a lack of proportion. The social effects of eighteenth-century industrial changes are dealt with in 10 lines, followed by 7 on George III's madness. The French Revolution has 28 lines, the Revolutionary Wars 2 pages, and the Napoleonic Wars a chapter of 7 pages. The later chapters, especially the two on the post-war world, are so summarized as to be colourless. An intelligent pupil may realize something of the complexities behind simple statements on earlier episodes if he compares what he read and heard and saw in the autumn of 1956 about Suez with the 9-line summary on p. 235. The sketch maps are clear, but show no mountains or hills, and it is somewhat prodigal in a book of 237 pages to have two maps of Roman Britain and to give a whole page to a map of the Crimea. Only two errors have been noted: Telfer for Telford on p. 155, and 1837 as the date of the Indian Mutiny on p. 179.

Rayner's Histories are both well-trying textbooks, clearly arranged, and the *Short* version well illustrated, even if some of the photographs of reconstructions are over imaginative, but it is disappointing that the opportunity has not been taken to eliminate a number of 'common errors' in the earlier parts, especially of the *Concise*. The Roman Wall was garrisoned by auxiliary troops (*Short*, p. 16) not by legionaries from York (*Concise*, p. 5), and both err in implying that the Anglo-Saxon village land was always divided into three fields, and these into strips separated by grass balks. On the matter of the Turks and the Discoveries the *Concise* states that a new route had to be found after the

Turkish conquests and goes on to the Portuguese voyages, while the *Short* does mention 'a new desire to find out what was beyond the limits of the known world' and an improved mariners' compass as well as the Turks, and dates the Portuguese voyages from 1440. In the nearer centuries one can but marvel how, in the *Short* volume, so many characters are briefly set in their places: in one period it is Wesley, Wilkes, 'Junius', Johnson, Gibbon, Garrick and Goldsmith; in another it is General and Charles Booth, Ruskin, Morris, Gilbert and Sullivan, Browning, Tennyson and the Victorian novelists. More could be made of economic and social developments than separate sections on Trade and Transport, the Agricultural Revolution and the Industrial Revolution, given about the same amount of space as that taken by the Peninsular and Crimean Wars and the Indian Mutiny.

If there is still an apparent preference in some quarters for an approach through political history, it may be that the majority of our adolescents are given their history otherwise, for the author of *History through Great Lives*<sup>4</sup> asserts confidently that in the 'Secondary Modern School' 'the biographical treatment has long been accepted as the most satisfactory method of presenting history to young people'. However, since there is also an attempt throughout 'to sketch in the background of each, so as to give a glimpse of life in bygone times', the treatment may not have been found so completely satisfactory. Each story has an arresting opening, they are well written, and the suggestions for further work will be helpful. There are a few errors of fact in the first part: the settlers of 449 were Jutes, not Saxons; there is some confusion between the statement on p. 44 that the country settled down under three kings c. 600 and that on p. 69 concerning Egbert, who 'had made himself overlord of the other six kingdoms' of southern England. The emphasis is on the modern: Book 3 runs from Washington to Livingstone; Book 4 from Edison to Churchill, and includes double biographies of the Wrights and Whittle, Curie and Fleming, Marconi and Baird, Amundsen and Scott. The most striking developments of our century are concisely presented in outline and should assist the pupil to realize that History, in the author's phrase, is 'something which he or she is even now helping to make'—a vital aim.

E. H. Dance's *The Modern World*, Book 3,<sup>5</sup> has been continued to the present day and contains excellent material which a teacher may use to his own satisfaction, and E. E. Milliken's *The Stuarts*<sup>6</sup> cannot but awaken interest in its presentation of original material, although the enclosing of some extracts in 'boxes' perhaps unduly breaks up the narrative, which also contains contemporary pieces. *Robert Bakewell*<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *History through Great Lives, Books 1-4*. By H. Bellis. Cassell. 1957. 168, 174, 166 and 172 pp. respectively. Line drawings. 6s. 6d. each.

<sup>5</sup> *The Modern World*. Book 3 of British and Foreign History. By E. H. Dance. New edition. Longmans. 1957. xii + 228 pp. Illustrations, maps, exercises and questions. 9s.

<sup>6</sup> *The Stuarts*. By E. K. Milliken. Harrap. 1957. 208 pp. Maps and illustrations. 8s. 6d.

<sup>7</sup> *Robert Bakewell*. By Boswell Taylor. No. 5 of 'They Served Mankind'. Macmillan. 1957. ii + 61 pp. Half-tone and line illustrations. Manilla covers. 1s. 9d.



is a welcome addition to a series cheap enough to be provided in numbers for individual work. The contents of *A Citizen of Today*<sup>8</sup> hardly justify its review in this section, but the author's hope that his readers 'should be less likely to be misled by catch phrases and slogans' will be echoed by all teachers of History, and certainly this clear exposition of the fundamentals of banking, insurance, taxation, and even of inflation and full employment, provides adequate background for some understanding of the society in which we find ourselves.

Three additions to the 'Methuen Outlines'<sup>9</sup> maintain the high standards of this enterprise. *Ancient Greece* almost adds a new dimension to a world of familiar stories by emphasizing development in an historical setting. It will be good for children to discover for themselves that Spartans were not always military fanatics, or that Athens was not always prosperous nor her citizens always wise. A half page on isolated events from the Romans to 1832 hardly justifies the claim that this is an outline 'down to the War of Independence in which Byron fought and died'. *The Elizabethan Seamen* is most informative, and maritime exploits, themselves vividly described, become so much more real when something is known of how the ships were built, manned and sailed, and of conditions aboard. The maps and drawing are excellent, but the political background suffers from compression, for example the life of Mary Stuart narrated in one paragraph. The story of *Football through the Ages* is most interesting, but there is no direct continuity between ancient and curious Oriental games and those played today. It is probably true that 'the desire to kick some object . . . seems inborn', and the resulting organized activity has always in developed communities acquired a social *mystique*, as may be observed today, even if the show business of soccer and the social cult of rugger are essentially the products of our industrial society. Many boys—and girls—will enjoy the book, and its illustrations, but why include Chaucer 'who wrote little about football' and a most unfortunate drawing of our most famous outside right?

Five other books,<sup>10</sup> on subjects rather more off the beaten track, may well be bought for school libraries to encourage the wider view. *Finding Fossil Man* is a clear introduction to the anthropology of our early ancestors, and *Journey into Roman Britain*, judging from its descriptions

<sup>8</sup> *A Citizen of Today*. By M. Hansen. Clarendon Press: O.U.P. 1957. 143 pp. 7s.

<sup>9</sup> *Ancient Greece*. By Duncan Taylor. Methuen. 1957. 76 pp. Maps and drawings; *The Elizabethan Seamen*. By R. R. Sellman. Methuen. 1957. 73 pp. Maps and drawings; *Football through the Ages*. By P. M. Young. Methuen. 1957. 68 pp. Drawings. 10s. 6d. each.

<sup>10</sup> *Finding Fossil Man*. By Robin Place. Rockliff Publishing Corporation. 1957. 126 pp., with 45 photographs and 36 line drawings. 20s.

*Journey into Roman Britain*. By G. M. Durant. Bell. 1957. viii + 264 pp. Photographs and drawings. 21s.

*The Scottish Highlands: a Short History*. By W. R. Kermack. W. and A. K. Johnston and G. W. Bacon. 1957. 160 pp., with 5 maps. 9s. 6d.

*A History of New Zealand Life*. By W. P. Morrell and D. O. W. Hall. Whitcombe and Tombs Ltd., Christchurch. 1957. 316 pp. Photographs and maps. 16s. 6d.

*An Introduction to the History of East Africa*. By Z. A. Marsh and G. Kingsnorth. C.U.P. 1957. xx + 263 pp., with 15 maps. School edition 9s. 6d. Library edition 15s.

of sites on or near the Wall, is factually sound as well as being most attractively written and well illustrated. *The Scottish Highlands* is refreshingly free from romanticism and sentimentality, and embodies the results of recent scholarship on such points as the origins of the Picts and the tartan. It deserves readers far outside the Scottish schools for which it was written. A similar comment can be made on *A History of New Zealand Life*, which gives an interesting account of the development of this often disregarded Dominion, with valuable material on wider topics like colonization and the growth of responsible government. The photographs are very good, particularly the reproductions of nineteenth-century prints. It was strangely topical in August 1957 to read, in *An Introduction to the History of East Africa*, of British support over a century ago for a Sultan and Imam of Oman who, having established his authority in Muscat, transferred his capital to Zanzibar, to which he introduced the cultivation of cloves. It is not only children who may well learn that East Africa had a recognizable civilization from early in our Middle Ages and that its coasts have been visited by traders from the Egyptians onwards. There is much information also on other parts of Africa in relation to the Slave Trade and the Partition, the inclusion of which perhaps detracts from the coherence of the book.

Two recent pamphlets may be briefly noticed.<sup>11</sup> W. K. Lowther-Clarke's short guide to Chichester Cathedral is exactly what the teacher guide needs, and, like the collection of local documents issued by the Eccles and District History Society for use in schools, leads one to hope for the preparation of many more similar local works. Two Historical Association leaflets<sup>12</sup> are intended for teachers but can be read by Sixth-Formers: Dr. Chaloner has briefly and effectively dealt with the last century myth of the Hungry Forties, while Mr. Barker has the much more complex and controversial topic of religious and political conflicts from 1559 to 1642. The issues are concisely set out in the light of recent work and attention is drawn to aspects often underrated in standard accounts.

Of the film-strips under review<sup>13</sup> that on *Elizabeth Fry* is a well-arranged collection of mainly contemporary prints and engravings which do convey an impression of the early nineteenth-century social scene without need of much explanation. The notes are informative and the introduction a model short biography of the subject. The one in-

<sup>11</sup> *Chichester Cathedral: its History and its Art*. By W. K. Lowther-Clarke. S.P.C.K. 1957. 107 pp. Line drawings. 3s. 6d.

*Eccles and Swinton: the Past Speaks for Itself*. Edited by F. R. Johnston. Eccles and District History Society, Central Library, Eccles, Manchester. 1957. vi + 25 pp. 2s. 6d. (2s. 9d. post free).

<sup>12</sup> *The Hungry Forties*. By W. H. Chaloner; *Religion and Politics, 1559-1642*. By W. A. Barker. Nos. 1 and 2 of Aids for Teachers Series. Routledge and Kegan Paul for the Historical Association. 1957. 12 pp. each. 2s. each.

<sup>13</sup> *Elizabeth Fry*. 39 frames, notes by Cecil Northcott. Common Ground CGB723. 16s. 6d.

*The Medieval Town*. 27 frames, notes by C. L. Hammer. E.P. no. 6072. 25s. Colour.

*The History of Winchester*. 38 frames, notes by Alice B. Walford. E.P. no. 4948. 15s.

*The Story of Money*. 33 frames, notes and drawings by Geoffrey Heney. E.P. no. 5054. 15s.

congruous frame is of the Battle of Trafalgar, included apparently as a peg on which to hang a reference to the wars as a cause of distress. *The Mediæval Town* consists of 'Colour photographs of Carcassonne interspersed with photographs of models of London from the London Museum', not always a happy integration; the impression left is that of a static society, and there are a number of irrelevant frames like 'a great lord visits the church', 'a monastery church'. *The History of Winchester* is better because it deals with a real town and its visible remains. It dies in 1817 with Jane Austen: 'from the eighteenth century Winchester really seems to have been in the shade'. *The Story of Money* has apparently been produced without consulting either a competent numismatist or a practising teacher. Space forbids detail of a formidable list of doubtful interpretations if not actual errors, from the dubious *Bron-desium* (hence bronze) in the note to frame 4 to the highly coloured stories concerning the Templars and Charles II retailed in the notes to frames 17 and 22 respectively. Much more serious is the inconsequence of frames and notes, which do not make clear the developing use of money and further confuse the issue by mixing in near the end references to the history of banking. A second section on coins, shown in various scale sizes, would have been of far more value if inserted in the appropriate places in the main sequence. The drawing throughout is generally unrealistic, witness the whirling wheels but unruffled horses in frame 27; and contemporary illustrations are neglected completely. The style of the notes is incredible: 'Yes! the problem bristled with difficulties' and 'Oh, yes, punishment for cheats in the olden days was a grim and cruel business' are typical comments.

In conclusion a heretic may perhaps be allowed to observe that even the best of these strips has not converted him from the view that their value in teaching is exaggerated. Apart from practical difficulties, only a few frames are really needed on a particular occasion and the choice is too often between abstinence and much irrelevant matter in an unsuitable order: slides are far more useful. If we must have film-strips, can publishers not ensure that better standards are maintained, not least in the notes, by experts akin to those publishers' readers whose work has recently been made known to the listening public by Mr. Frank Swinnerton?



---

## EDITORIAL NOTES

---

THE STUDY of the history of history may be a secondary activity, but it can provide contributions to historical understanding that could hardly come from any other source. Above all, it can help to keep historical thinking alert and free from the temptation to rest upon stereotyped formulæ. The opportunity to publish in this number of *History* two articles in the field of historiography is therefore a welcome one.

It is probably not unfair to suggest that the writing of contemporary history is often regarded with a measure of suspicion—all the more so because it has recently been pursued on such an unprecedented scale that an American historian has even asked plaintively whether history is about the past. One can understand his alarm, particularly if one considers the factors which are responsible for this concentration of interest. Governments and other bodies have wanted the history of their own recent activities to be chronicled; because of a belief in the utility—indeed the necessity—of the study of recent history, the great corporations have been anxious to promote historical activity in this field; and natural public interest in our own times leads publishers to look with a favourable eye on books that deal with them. All this has provided a considerable stimulus to the writing of contemporary history; a tendency to criticize the result has been the not unnatural reaction.

In this situation it is a salutary shock to be reminded by Professor Momigliano—or perhaps to learn for the first time—that for long periods in the ancient world, and even later, it was not contemporary history but the history of the past that needed to be defended. Thucydides did not have to apologize for writing the history of his own times: it was Herodotus who was discredited for believing that it was possible to write the history of former ages. We can now perhaps look at this matter more impartially and see that the reasons for both the modern and ancient prejudices are essentially the same. Ancient historians, after Herodotus, believed, Professor Momigliano tells us, that it was not possible to obtain reliable evidence about the past; more recently this suspicion has been directed to the history of the present. The lesson to be drawn may be that if the same standards of critical scholarship can be and are applied, then the writing of contemporary history and of the history of the past are both justifiable. It would even be reasonable to suppose that on this level they can stimulate and fructify each other.

The President of the Historical Association raises another problem in historiography. His book *George III and the Historians* has recently aroused some discussion. His article on one aspect of the same problem is likewise not uncontroversial; but it is not the function of *History* to publish only articles so innocuous or obscure that nobody could disagree, or even agree, with them. There is no finality in historical interpretation. However, history

changes not so much by contradiction—and Sir Lewis Namier's scholarship is not easily or with impunity to be contradicted—as by a shift in the point of view. Even the greatest historian, however high-soaring, cannot encompass in one eagle-glance the whole of life. Working in an age bedevilled by warring ideologies, and reacting rightly against the exaggerated belief of nineteenth-century historians in the influence of theorists and the power of ideas, Sir Lewis has exhibited a healthy scepticism about them. Other historians have gone much farther. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that the general climate of opinion among British historians since the First World War has been so cold to anything even smelling of an idea that any exotic plants of this kind that happened to be produced were rapidly killed off and those who would rashly have cultivated them taught the error of their ways.<sup>1</sup>

It seems to me that a part of what Professor Butterfield is trying to do is to bring ideas—not necessarily those of the study, but those of the debating chamber or the market place—back into the historical consciousness. This, I believe, is something worth doing, regardless of the merits or demerits of any particular interpretation of the reign of George III. Political ideas are inevitably part of any political system of government. Even the merest Tammany Hall boss will have here and there, hidden in the recesses of his mind, nestling in the folds and convolutions of intrigue, or buried under layers of dead mental matter, an occasional fossil idea. There may be long periods, perhaps even of recorded history, when the struggle for life or the dominance of autocracy leaves no room for political thought of even the most rudimentary kind. It is doubtful if any period of modern British history falls into this category, not even the mid-eighteenth century.

Admittedly the treatment of the rôle of ideas in history, especially those of social groups or political parties, is peculiarly liable to degenerate into unscholarly generalization. In the historical discussion of such concepts as Toryism, Jacobinism, Bonapartism, an inadequate social analysis may be combined with a shadowy and uncertain theoretical pattern, and the result be merely confusion worse confounded. Sir Lewis has taught us not to take such terms for granted in any period of history. Whigs and Tories, Royalists and Puritans, Jacobins and Girondins, feudal nobles and gentry, Roman senators, the whole mysterious complex of the middle classes, are now looked on with a suspicious scrutinizing eye, before which many time-honoured historical stereotypes have wilted. In a sense we all belong to the 'Namier school', for we have certainly all been to school to Sir Lewis's meticulous research and powerful analysis. If the revival of interest in what people thought, as a necessary clue to the understanding of what they did, is accompanied by the same standards of critical scholarship, the course of political and Parliamentary history will not desert its well-dug channels but will flow

<sup>1</sup> I remember hearing one distinguished historian—quite unconnected with Sir Lewis Namier—say, emulating Henry Ford on history, 'Political ideas are bunk'; and another sum up the author of the *Letter to a Noble Lord* in the words, 'Burke was the perfect butler'. These doubtless were mere *boutades* and Sir Lewis has no responsibility for them. He himself writes, 'The effort which people put up to avoid thinking might almost enable them to think and to have some new ideas. But having ideas produces anxiety and *malaise* and runs counter to the deepest instincts of human nature, which loves symmetry, repetition and routine. Mine certainly does'. It would be unfair to end the quotation here; it continues '—and to such a degree that I get sick of them, and then notice that proclivity in others and criticize it.' He ends, and perhaps we should not take this too seriously, 'It is a mistake to suppose that people think: they wobble with the brain, and sometimes the brain does not wobble.' ('Symmetry and Repetition', 1941, in *Conflicts*, 1942, pp. 69, 72.)

clearer and deeper; and it will escape the danger of being dissipated and disappearing in the sands of insignificant intrigue.

\* \* \*

Mr. J. W. Herbert writes: 'Mr. E. T. Rhymer, who died in October 1957, was for over twenty years President of the North London Branch of the Historical Association. He was a member of Council, Vice-President, and for nearly eight years Hon. Treasurer of the Association. His strong character, clarity of thought, and sound judgement were of inestimable value during the period between the wars. His work for the Association was only one feature of an active life. Mr. Rhymer was a well known and highly esteemed figure in the public life of North London, and many tributes have been paid to his outstanding qualities as magistrate, chairman of Edmonton Petty Sessional Division, and to his noteworthy contribution to the advance of education. In spite of physical disabilities and suffering during the last ten years, he retained a keen interest in all that pertained to the well-being of the Historical Association to which he had given so many years of devoted and loyal service.'

\* \* \*

At the Annual General Meeting of the Historical Association, to be held this year from 9 to 12 April in Newcastle upon Tyne, the great historic traditions of Northumberland and Durham will be well represented. Professor Ian Richmond will be speaking on the Roman frontier, Mr. P. Hunter Blair on Northumbrian learning in the seventh and eighth centuries, and Professor Hughes on a later period in the history of the North East. Visits will be made to the Roman Wall, to castles such as Newcastle, Durham, Alnwick and Warkworth, to Durham Cathedral, Tynemouth Priory and other great military or ecclesiastical sites; the annual dinner will be held in the eighteenth-century Assembly Rooms at Newcastle; and for those who book for it an Association tour, centred on Ford Castle, will begin on Saturday, 12 April.

\* \* \*

ERRATUM:—Vol. xlii, p. 128, l. 32, *for* 25 May *read* 23 May.



---

## REVIEWS AND SHORT NOTICES

---

### ANCIENT

HEBREW MAN, translated by Peter R. Ackroyd (London: S.C.M. Press. 1956. 189 pp. 12s. 6d.), by Professor L. Köhler, an Old Testament scholar of international reputation, contains a collection of some of his more popular essays on the physical characteristics of the Hebrews, their daily occupation, their modes of thought and their administration of justice. Students of Ancient History who have no special knowledge of the background of Biblical civilization will greatly benefit from the author's presentation of ordinary life in a Hebrew village or townlet of the first millennium B.C. *Alttestamentler* too will be grateful for the brief and often original summary on the problems under discussion. Many, however, will feel that the specific contribution of the Hebrew Man is not sufficiently stressed. Religious ideas such as monotheism, creation, revelation and redemption are hardly discussed, and general observations, which would apply to most civilizations round the Mediterranean coastline, obscure the dynamic impact of the Hebrew legacy on world history.

*University College, London*

S. STEIN

A HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THUCYDIDES. By A. W. Gomme. Vols. II and III. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1956. xi + ix + 748 pp. 84s.

These further volumes of Professor Gomme's fine commentary cover Books II-V. 24, i.e. the period of the Ten Years' War (431-421 B.C.). Among the matters treated are the finances of Athens, Pericles' Funeral Speech, the Pestilence of 428 (which Gomme argues was typhus), the fall of Plataea and the capture of Sphakteria, the character of Cleon and his importance for the war. The detailed commentary is continuously exciting to the Thucydidean scholar, but the general historian may also find interesting the discussions (identifiable through the Index under 'Athens') of ancient democracy: it did not suppress individual liberty (as Constant and de Coulanges, who are now interesting for their 'utter unawareness of the inroads on individual liberty which the modern democratic state was about to make', supposed), but merely found it not so necessary to formulate it.

This commentary is admirable, not merely for the breadth of scholarship with which Gomme assembles the newer resources of modern scholarship (treaties, tribute-lists, and so on), but, even more, for the quality of imagination, the sense of personally reliving the events, which he so often suggests, in the midst of sober discussion or narration. The speeches (how far actual, how far Thucydides' imagination?) are a well-known crux. Here is how Gomme sees that of the Plataeans come into being. He conjectures that some eye-witness from among the besiegers told Thucydides of the fall of Plataea: 'he may have told him also that the speeches were particularly affecting and

in a better world would have been effective; if Thucydides asked, what did they say? The answer may have been, "only the usual things—the Persian Wars, the gods and the oaths, the special sanctity of Plataea, the honour of Sparta; but it was very honestly done"; and in that event he clothed it in the language that we have, and made it of such and such a length, because he wanted it for his purpose' (i.e. to illustrate the *mores* of men at war). Simple words, but how moving in their directness, how *Greek*, how worthy of Thucydides.

*University College, London*

J. H. KELLS

LA PREMIÈRE CAMPAGNE DE CÉSAR CONTRE LES GERMAINS, 58 AVANT JÉSUS-CHRIST. By Raymond Schmittlein. Paris: Presses Universitaires. 1957. 216 pp. 1000 fr.

Cæsar sometimes receives curious treatment these days in the country whose conquest he described. With scholarship ingenious almost to the point of perversity Rambaud has recently convinced himself (but few others) that Cæsar's *De bello Gallico* is little more than a tissue of lies. Now Schmittlein, who comes from a very different stable, believing that it takes a good deal more than scholarship to turn Cæsar into a good liar or a bad general and recognizing that the campaigns of 58 B.C. took place not just because Cæsar was spoiling for a fight and greedy for a military reputation but because a dangerous storm which had been brewing for some years on the northern frontier of Transalpine Gaul broke in that year, has produced a fresh and extremely readable book, full of bright ideas, none of them the less bright for being, almost certainly, wrong.

His first, most interesting, suggestion is that the battle at which with Ariovistus' co-operation the Sequani beat the Aedui in 61 was not the battle of Admagetobriga (or the battle near Magetobriga), but that the battle of Magetobriga (Magdebourg, of course!) was an earlier battle fought east of the Rhine by a coalition of Celtic (Gallic) tribes which then lived east of the Rhine (Rauraci, Helvetii, Boii, Treveri etc.), in 72 B.C., the date being deduced from Ariovistus' statement in 58 that the Suebi had been homeless and on the move for fourteen years (*B.G.* 1,36,7); by 61 they were, on the heels of the defeated east-of-the-Rhine Gauls, across the Rhine and helping the Sequani to beat the Aedui at a battle whose name is unknown. If this were true, we should be on our way to a solution of the problem which so worries Rambaud and, more seriously, Walser, of how, when archæology shows the peoples immediately east of the Rhine in the period of the late Roman Republic to have been Celts, Cæsar should state that in the fifties the peoples east of the Rhine were Germans. All turns on the reading of *B.G.* 1,31,12 in its context. The context, alas, gives the hypothesis none of the support that it needs.

With the assistance of maps and photographs (none of them particularly easy to interpret) Schmittlein makes his own identification of the site of the battle at which Cæsar defeated Ariovistus, just north of Belfort. (The tower 'de la Miotte' destroyed by the Germans in 1940 was, on this view, originally erected by the Romans to mark the site of their victory.) Finally, the battle itself, and the rout of the Germans. Schmittlein's account of the battle is altogether unattractive; for it is absolutely impossible to make the Latin of *B.G.* 1,52 mean anything but that the Romans attacked with their right

flank (commanded by Cæsar himself) and that the German left flank was driven in. And, as for the rout, there is nothing new about the suggestion that the Germans were chased fifty, not five, miles to the Rhine. The statement of Orosius vi,7 makes this certain and Rice Holmes in 1914 printed 'milia passuum . . . circiter L' in his text of *B.G.* I,53,1.

*Exeter College, Oxford*

J. P. V. D. BALSDON

STUDIES IN JEWISH HISTORY. By A. Büchler. Edited by I. Brodie and J. Rabinowitz. (Oxford University Press. 1956. xxx + 256 pp. 50s.) Dr. Adolph Büchler, late Principal of Jews' College, restricted his researches in Jewish History to the first three centuries of the current era, on which his authority was universally recognized. His work is marked by the cautious reserve of the sound scholar, great originality and a masterly handling of the sources. This memorial volume contains a representative selection of eleven articles—seven translated into English from German, one from French, and three in the original Hebrew.

THE TEMPLE OF JERUSALEM (London: S.C.M. Press. 1957. 112 pp. 9s. 6d.) and GOLGOTHA AND THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE (London: S.C.M. Press. 1957. 127 pp. 10s. 6d.), both by André Parrot, are translations from the French and can be recommended most warmly. The author is a distinguished French archæologist who writes with admirable lucidity and scholarship. The second work in particular is a model of its kind, guaranteed to awaken the interest of those who read it, whether they be schoolteachers, sixth-formers or general readers.

Greek physical science is well surveyed and placed in its philosophical setting by S. Sambursky in *THE PHYSICAL WORLD OF THE GREEKS*, translated from the Hebrew by M. Dagut (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1956. 255 pp. 25s.). His comparisons with modern science will be of interest to the physicist, but are perhaps not so helpful for an understanding of the, to us, alien background of Greek thought.

A new chapter in the history of British archæology, and one full of fascination, speculation, and even fancy, has been opened by T. C. Lethbridge's *GOGMAGOG: THE BURIED GODS* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1957. 181 pp. 21s.).

## MEDIEVAL

FEUDALISM IN HISTORY. Edited by R. Coulborn. Princeton University Press. 1956. xiv + 437 pp. 68s.

This book is the outcome of 'an informal conference on the Interpretation of History . . . designed to bring together Arnold Toynbee with some of us who were interested in his views'. The subject of the conference and the book is a comparative study of feudalism and an enquiry into how far feudalism describes 'a general method of political organization' and not 'one unique constitution'. Like Gaul, the book is divided into three parts of unequal worth. The first is a very short discussion of the idea of feudalism; it is followed by a series of special discussions by individual experts on the history of eight different societies; finally we are given a long essay by Mr. Rushton Coulborn which seeks to erect a theory of comparative feudalism on the basis of the eight particular studies in the preceding section.



The particular studies are often very interesting. Mr. Bodde, for instance, in an essay on Chinese feudalism, shows how historical problems can be interestingly discussed in the entire absence of evidence, as the word is normally understood. In the end most of the special studies reject the notion of a feudal stage for the societies with which they are concerned. Mr. Coulborn is left with the task of synthesis. He is plainly a convinced believer in 'uniformities in history' of which he is sure feudalism is one. One could wish he had defined his terms more closely and noted the wise words on historians' terminology with which Dr. Kantorowicz prefaced his little study of byzantine 'feudalism'. As it is Mr. Coulborn is content to speak of feudalism both as a stage in the creation of a more or less centralized empire and as a consequence of the breakdown of a once great central power. His essay shows that it is possible given a loose enough terminology to talk about feudalism as one of the uniformities in history, without talking obvious nonsense. What he has not shown is what modern philosophers call the cash value of such talk—its relevance to concrete historical situations, its power to explain those situations and in general why any rational person should wish to talk in this way. This is a book very much for the believer.

*University of Manchester*

ERIC JOHN

DAS STRANDRECHT IN NORDEUROPA IM MITTELALTER. By V. Niitemaa. (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Ser. B, vol. 94.) Helsinki. 1955. 416 pp.

Dr. Niitemaa's subject is the history of the law of shipwreck and salvage from the twelfth to the early sixteenth century, and the evidence he uses is almost exclusively drawn from the Baltic area. In general terms he shows how the original right of local inhabitants to keep all goods salvaged was modified, first to reduce their claim merely to a proportion of the goods so saved and ultimately to give them no more than a reward or payment for participation in the actual work of salvage. The effect of this development in mitigating the risk incurred by commercial entrepreneurs is obvious enough. It is not surprising, therefore, that the cities of medieval Europe should have set themselves to secure 'die Freiheit des Strandes' as well as 'die Freiheit des Meeres', either as a matter of special privilege in countries to which commerce took their citizens or of established law. It was equally natural that rulers, who wished to attract foreign traders to their lands, should also have been willing in some cases to modify antecedent custom to give greater encouragement to merchants who might have the ill-fortune to suffer shipwreck. In the long run, these were perhaps more effective forces in transforming the law of wreck than the Christian humanitarian and Roman law ideas which Dr. Niitemaa is perhaps inclined to overvalue. At the same time, he is able to show that this problem had a wider importance in the political circumstances of northern Europe between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries. The co-existence of a league of Hanseatic towns and the Baltic kingdoms led to a struggle for power which revolved around 'Strandrecht' amongst other issues—a natural enough thing in circumstances where commercial supremacy was not the least important of the supremacies at stake. The history of the law governing wreck and salvage, therefore, has to take account of this important episode in Baltic history, and Dr. Niitemaa's treatment of it will be of interest to the student of general European history. It is,

however, for his treatment of his particular problem that he has earned our special gratitude. It is a matter which has not been widely debated, and the evolution of the law of wreck in the Baltic states as he has described it may evoke comparison with similar developments in our medieval English law. Bracton tells us that, by the law of nature, wreck had once belonged to the finder; but that now, by the *jus gentium*, it belonged to the prince. Naturally, the prince often gave away this amongst his other rights as a franchise. Bracton wrote, however, only shortly before a statute of Edward I abolished the right to appropriate salvaged goods where a man or a cat or a dog was saved from the wreck. Parallels with the evolution of the law of wreck in northern Europe are obvious; but there is much to be done in Dr. Niite-maa's fashion before the development of our English law on this matter can be anything like so well known.

*St. John's College, Cambridge*

EDWARD MILLER

THE PURSUIT OF THE MILLENNIUM. By Norman Cohn. London: Secker and Warburg. 1957. xvi + 476 pp. 42s.

This book traces the history of millennial movements in the Middle Ages and the early sixteenth century. The area covered is mainly Germany and France. Mr. Cohn begins by discussing apocalyptic elements in Jewish and Christian teaching and early elaborations of this material. The author is at pains to relate the phenomena to social conditions and, in general, finds the early middle ages unpropitious to mass revolutionary chiliasm. His earliest cases come in the late eleventh century with the Crusade. From then on groups of fanatics become more common until, in the late middle ages, economic regression hits the now numerous urban centres, producing economic and social disorientation, both of which Mr. Cohn feels were necessary pre-requisites for the full growth of the hysteria he is describing.

Many movements began in fairly orthodox, if extreme, piety, only later moving to a stage of maniac conviction that the old world was ending, a new world within sight. Thus both flagellants and Beghards always had a mass of adherents who were non-revolutionary, and a fringe who were possessed. National sentiment took a hand in various ways. Divided Germany was constantly susceptible to the promises of a reincarnated Frederick who would usher in the final stages of history—a tradition which culminated in the terrifying 'Book of a hundred chapters' in the early sixteenth century. And hatred of Germany in part stimulated the Taborites of Bohemia, who numbered in their ranks extreme Adamites. Brethren of the Free Spirit, whose elect were individually identified with God, are commoner in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, paving the way for the egalitarian communities, of whom the most famous were the so-called Anabaptists in Reformation Germany. Mr. Cohn's discussion of this last stage is the most absorbing in the book. For this a much fuller documentation is partly responsible. In earlier episodes the author has often to contend with obscure and fugitive references and perhaps sometimes builds rather too substantially on slender foundations.

A perusal of a book wholly devoted to this nightmare world of apocalyptic fanaticism is salutary for historians. True, the impact on general history of many of these movements (the Taborite extremists and the Anabaptists are the main exceptions) was fortunately slight; though many Jews and priests were slaughtered from time to time, the chiliasts of various kinds were not

cohesive or influential and—as in Münster in 1535—had only a nauseating terror to put in place of the reality of history. But pie in the sky is a long-lasting commodity and it is well to remember that our own mad days have no monopoly of it.

For Mr. Cohn, indeed, this is the central point of his study. He points out that in most of the groups he discusses there are regularly repeated characteristics: a prophetic figure (who often moves from prophecy to a Godlike leadership), a revelation of a period of bloody calamity to be followed by earthly bliss, a following mainly illiterate and often oppressed by misery and social insecurity, and a view of the rich and especially the clergy as monstrous tyrants, as Antichrist. The author points out the similarity between these features and those of National Socialism in Germany and Communism—and they are striking. For Mr. Cohn this is an invitation to discuss the problem in psychological terms and he accordingly moves modestly into the no-man's-land between history and sociology. How convincing his explanation of mass movements in terms of individual neurosis may be a historian can hardly be expected to say.

A historian may, however, ask why, since urbanization seems important in Mr. Cohn's thesis, Italian material is relatively neglected: St. Francis is merely referred to and Joachimite teaching is dealt with only as an influence outside Italy. In all this, health is as significant as disease and one wonders why England remained comparatively immune. Was strong monarchy an element? Is politics as important as economics in this field? Is this why Germany suffered and why England's only real chiliasts, the Ranters, appeared during the Interregnum? (Mr. Cohn prints in an appendix a most useful documentation of the Ranters.)

A very full bibliography of original sources and secondary writers completes this extremely interesting and well-written book.

*University of Edinburgh*

DENYS HAY

A HISTORY OF ANTONY BEK, BISHOP OF DURHAM 1283-1311. By C. M. Fraser. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1957. 266 pp. 42s.

On the heels of Mr. G. V. Scammell's biography of Hugh of le Puiset follows Miss Fraser's history of Antony Bek. No two great bishops could have been more unlike; and, as perhaps the difference in the titles suggests, the authors' treatment has little in common. Hugh of le Puiset pursued an independent career in isolation from the royal court. Antony Bek rose to greatness in the king's service and remained a busy royal servant. The contrast in career doubtless explains to some extent the contrast in the plan of the books. Whereas Mr. Scammell takes five broad subjects and devotes a long chapter to each, Miss Fraser's arrangement is largely chronological. She follows Bek's fortunes with the king, turning only occasionally to the affairs of his diocese.

The emphasis on the diplomatic history of Edward I's reign, while producing, it is true, an outward history of Bek, produces unfortunately little more. To record every scrap of royal business in which Bek was involved does not greatly advance our knowledge either of the reign or of the bishop. The approach would be lucrative only if we could observe events through Bek's eyes or see their inward effect on him. It is almost impossible to interpret thirteenth-century events and men in these ways; but, strangely enough, Miss Fraser does not even attempt a character sketch of her hero, apart



from a few perfunctory remarks at the end of the book. Yet was he nothing more than the overbearing political figure which emerges from the bare recital of his actions?

Within the limitations she has imposed on herself Miss Fraser has written a careful account of Bek's career. It is interesting to observe how Bek, when secure in the king's favour, could flout with impunity his tenants, the convent, the metropolitan, and the pope. We see the splendid theory of a palatinate advanced, and the proud servants of a proud bishop make extravagant claims for it. Yet everything depended on royal tolerance. When Bek and Edward were friends, the bishop could shake off the complaints of his wronged subordinates and injured ecclesiastical superiors. But once there was a rift, he was in danger of being crushed. And the king had only to include in a writ the formula *non omittas propter libertatem* and the defences of this vaunted palatinate were pierced. The great domestic issue of the pontificate was Bek's struggle with the convent of Durham and his duel with the monk, Richard of Hoton. Miss Fraser disentangles this story with skill, and all the moves and counter-moves are laid bare. But, again, we remain on the surface of events. By presenting the case from Bek's side, Miss Fraser tends to treat Hoton simply as an agitator. It may well be that the diocesan's case was better than the chapter's. But the support which Hoton got from his brethren and his courageous, protracted, and almost successful stand give him a claim to more consideration than he receives here.

Perhaps the greatest merit of Miss Fraser's reticence is that the reader is provoked to reflect on the moral issues. Bek was a great bishop in the eyes of the world; but was he not completely scandalous in a Church which, although it had its weaknesses, was displaying at least great intellectual power? Had Bek any interest apart from exploiting his bishopric and honour as an estate to serve the ambition of himself and his royal master? And what of his magnanimity? Was this really, as Miss Fraser suggests, more than 'a lofty disregard for the petty details of daily life'? Miss Fraser has assembled the facts and has cleverly created a coherent story. Her book can be read with Miss Decima Douie's on Archbishop Pecham as another commentary on some aspects of Edward I's reign, and with Mr. Scammell's as a further chapter in the history of an exceptional and most interesting diocese and honour.

*University of Exeter*

FRANK BARLOW

Dom Aelred Watkin is to be congratulated on completing his edition of *THE GREAT CHARTULARY OF GLASTONBURY*, vol. III (Somerset Record Soc. Publications no. lxiv. The Society. 1956. xli + 217 pp. subs.).<sup>1</sup> Following the form of the earlier volumes the editor gives a brief descriptive analysis of the documents as well as the Latin text of most of them (two, nos. 1187 and 1213, are in French). This volume completes the collection of title-deeds covering the abbey's property in Devon, Dorset, Hampshire, Wiltshire, and Berkshire. These include copies of Anglo-Saxon diplomas; most, if not all, have been printed before and it is questionable whether it was worth reprinting without critical apparatus. It is interesting to find the involved, high-sounding Latin of the diplomas reappearing many centuries later in the preamble and ending of a charter of Abbot Adam, 1335 (no. 1332). Besides charters, there are

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *History*, xxxiv. 284, xl. 357.

a few records of inquisitions (no. 1193 concerns suit of court to the abbot's hundred court of Domesday, no. 1232 gives a decision on pasturage rights at Christian Melford). A cartulary does not often shed much light on the internal working of a monastic house, but at the end of this one is a series of ordinances of the abbot and chapter, c. 1287-1340, which arrange for the distribution of alms and pittances, the substitution of money for payments in kind from the abbot's exchequer to obedientiaries, and the granting of money to each monk for his *camera*: presumably (in contradiction to recent laws) a clothing allowance. The editing seems to be carefully done, but the editor has sometimes been too sparing of comment. *Redecimatio*, in nos. 1311, 1321, is equated to tithing, which cannot be right and covers an interesting example of an obscure term. The elaborate (but consistent) date of a charter of the last Anglo-Saxon abbot should have raised a question about the usually accepted date of his deposition (no. 1300). The editor has furnished useful indexes of persons and places which serve all three volumes; he would have helped the reader if he had appended a dated list of the abbots of Glastonbury. It should be noted that, concentrating as he does on the cartulary proper, he has left out the extraneous matter which occupies the last twenty-three folios of the volume (cf. vol. I, p. x).

*Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*

G. R. CHENEY

GUNPOWDER AND FIREARMS IN THE MAMLUK KINGDOM: A CHALLENGE TO A MEDIEVAL SOCIETY. By David Ayalon. London: Valentine, Mitchell. 1956. xvii + 154 pp. 30s.

The interaction of military techniques and social development is a subject which has seldom received, from professional historians in this country, the close study which it deserves, and Dr. Ayalon's monograph is a good example of what can be achieved by minute investigation of one problem within this fruitful field. His thesis is a bold one, in sharp contrast to the scholarly exactness of his critical method: the main reason, he contends, for the collapse of the Mamluk rule in Egypt before the Ottoman invaders of the sixteenth century was the rigid conservatism of social and military tradition which kept the Mamluks from adopting the firearms to which the Ottomans owed, in such large measure, their military success. The Ottomans had been compelled to keep up to date in military techniques by their constant struggles with European enemies already equipped with cannon and arquebus. The existence of a corps of archers in the Janissaries made possible the introduction of the arquebus without great disturbance to their existing military organization, and the Ottoman Sultans had power absolute enough to override any conservative opposition to military change. But the Mamluk Sultans were no more than *primus inter pares* in a society of quarrelling cliques whose whole way of life centred round the horse and the *arme blanche*. Those rulers who attempted to develop the manufacture and use of firearms were met with stubborn opposition and vehemently abused. Arquebus companies, when they were belatedly formed, consisted of black slaves or ill-paid mercenaries who were used only on secondary campaigns. And when at length the Mamluk horsemen perished in swaths before the Ottoman fire, they complained that it was unfair. 'Woe to thee! how darest thou shoot with firearms at Muslims?' It was the dying cry of a society, echoed simultaneously in the plains of Northern Italy by the chivalry of France.

Dr. Ayalon sustains his argument with a wealth of material from chronicles, whose reliability and phraseology he expertly analyses. His closely-reasoned argument that the word *naft* was used in the fifteenth century to mean not simply Greek fire but also gunpowder puts much of the military history of the period in a new and illuminating perspective. Of the correctness of his views on this and similar linguistic matters only an expert Arabist can judge. The general historian can only be grateful that a scholar of Dr. Ayalon's quality should have applied his talents to a subject of such wide interest as this.

*King's College, London*

MICHAEL HOWARD

Lt.-Col. A. H. Burne, D.S.O., as a writer on military matters ranges from the whole art of land warfare to the topographical study of the English battlefields. In *THE AGINCOURT WAR* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1956. 359 pp. 35s.), as in *The Crecy War* (Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1955. 30s.), he tells a straightforward story of the Hundred Years War. He concentrates on military aspects rather than the diplomatic and administrative background. The widest possible ranges of both standard and out-of-the-way sources have been consulted, and their credibility or otherwise discussed with much forcefulness. Many of those emanating from 'monkish clerks' receive brisk treatment. Edward III is seen as a master of strategy; 'there was no general massacre at Limoges'; the killing of prisoners during the battle of Agincourt was fully justified; and for whatever happened after Caen was assaulted in 1417 there was 'nothing for which to condemn the English king'. On practically all battlefields the English were outnumbered; their victories, according to Lt.-Col. Burne, were the result of deliberation, first-rate staff work and far-seeing strategical planning. Anyone who has ever supposed that Edward III, the Black Prince or Henry V simply blundered on their foes or were hunted down or owed anything much to the long-bow or luck or the courage of desperation and 'backs-to-the-wall', had better read Lt.-Col. Burne and think again. It is perhaps healthy to be reminded that brains play their part in battles as well as brawn. There are many vigorous pen-portraits of English leaders: Bedford, Salisbury, 'peerless John Talbot' and of course Henry V. Joan of Arc gets fewer references, and the extraordinary thing is that the English actually lost the Hundred Years War.

Besides the racy vigour of the style and the absorbing nature of the narrative, these books have one great advantage over most academic writing on military matters. They have an out-of-doors air, a flavour of actuality drawn from Lt.-Col. Burne's tireless trappings across the actual places of which he writes. River-crossings, sunken roads, field-tracks, significant dips in the ground, the influence of streams and marshes, the still-existing traces of entrenchments and fortifications have been carefully studied on the spot. Many chapter appendixes allow personal observations and support for certain conclusions to be discussed at length.

Students, whether or not they accept all put before them, cannot fail to be stimulated, and the general reader, for whom Lt.-Col. Burne is writing, will be greatly entertained.

*Cherrywood School, Birmingham*

T. H. MCGUFFIE



CALENDAR OF SCOTTISH SUPPLICATIONS TO ROME 1423-1428. Edited by A. I. Dunlop. Scottish History Society Publications, 3rd Series, vol. XLVIII. Edinburgh: Constable. 1956. xxxvi + 261 pp.

The present volume continues Mrs. Dunlop's *Calendar of Scottish Supplications to Rome 1418-1422*, published by the Scottish History Society in 1934. The invaluable introductions to both volumes must be read as one if the reader is to make full use of the wealth of social, political, and diplomatic history which lies hidden among this mass of ecclesiastical raw material. Those already acquainted with these Registers of Supplications in the Vatican Archives will appreciate the immense technical difficulties which the editor has had to face and overcome in order to produce this Calendar in its present form. That she has successfully done so is both a demonstration of her mastery in a specialist field of studies, and a tribute to her skill and patience. One wonders if it might not have made the reader's task easier to have placed the modern spelling of persons and places boldly and consistently in the text, and to have relegated their curious and often unintelligible Datary variants to parentheses; as it is, without cross references in the Index, it is not always easy to recognize or confirm a familiar name. Again, it is sometimes difficult to see why Mrs. Dunlop occasionally adds the Latin text where no ambiguity exists. There are some minor slips, omissions and misprints, (e.g. the reference on p. ix to David Bean's supplication should read *p. 119*; and *Enerbervy* (*mod. Inverbervie*), p. 93, escapes the Index altogether). Nevertheless, the publication of this second volume will earn for its editor the permanent gratitude of all students of Scottish medieval history for an indispensable addition to their only too threadbare collection of source material.

King's College, Aberdeen

L. J. MACFARLANE

K. J. Hollyman in *LE DÉVELOPPEMENT DU VOCABULAIRE FÉODAL EN FRANCE PENDANT LE HAUT MOYEN ÂGE (ÉTUDE SÉMANTIQUE)*. (Geneva-Paris. 1957. Société de Publications romanes et françaises, lviii. 202 pp.) is mainly interested in the social factors which condition changes in the meanings of words. The book contains studies of the feudal development of such words as *dominus*, *senior*, *terra*, *feudus*, giving a useful selection of examples, mostly Latin, although a few early French and Provençal texts are also quoted.

*DEVIL'S BROOD* by Alfred Duggan (London: Faber. 1957. 278 pp. 21s.) is a stimulating picture of Henry II's relations with his family, based mainly on the works of Giraldus Cambrensis.

Genealogy, an end in itself for pioneer *chartistes*, is now studied as part of the total criticism of charters. The twelfth- and early thirteenth-century records of the Trussebut and Ros families, edited by Sir Charles Clay for the Yorkshire Archaeological Society's Extra Series in *EARLY YORKSHIRE CHARTERS*, Vol. X (Wakefield, for the Society. 1955. xxvii + 215 pp.) show the devolution of military-economic power in south-eastern Yorkshire and elsewhere, and contain much incidental evidence for political, ecclesiastical, social and legal history. There are collotype plates of twelve original charters, including a charter of Stephen hitherto assigned to Henry I.

R. Weiss's standard work, *HUMANISM IN ENGLAND DURING THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY*, first published in 1941, has been reissued in a second edition

(Oxford: Blackwell. 1957. 202 pp. 25s.) with the addition of important 'addenda and corrigenda' which bring the bibliographical references up to date.

## EARLY MODERN

A HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. Vol. I. By Hubert Jedin. Translated by Dom Ernest Graf, O.S.B. London: Nelson. 1957. 618 pp. 70s. In his preface to the first volume of his projected monumental history of the Council of Trent the author explains that Ranke thought it impossible to write a history of the council that was not either attack or defence. Until the end of the last century this was indeed technically impossible; for the Vatican had collected, in a secret archive, 155 volumes of the most important documents bearing on the council, especially eight volumes of official minutes of the sessions, compiled by Angelo Massarelli. Even Pallavicino, the great papal apologist, was allowed to use only single volumes of these minutes. When Pope Leo XIII opened the Vatican archives to scholars—one of the great landmarks in the history of historical scholarship—these technical difficulties disappeared. There remained the psychological difficulty of the historian's emancipation not only from the Protestant and Catholic but, on the Catholic side, from the papalist and anti-papalist points of view. Professor Jedin has not attempted such an emancipation. He writes from a frankly Catholic and anti-conciliarist point of view; that is, he rejects the theory, widely held in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, that the authority of a general council is superior to that of the pope. He is an avowed partisan of the idea of church reform through a general council, but under the authority and guidance of the pope. But Professor Jedin is an entirely honest historian. He makes a genuine and fair attempt to understand the Protestant point of view, even if he does not accept it on any doctrinal point. If his judgement is harsh on those who tried to obstruct the council and the reform of the church, he spares neither emperor nor pope. Perhaps he is less than fair to the French; but this is a small fault. The result of his partisanship is to make this long volume very readable.

With immense learning and great skill, Jedin leads the reader through the difficult story of the evolution of the ideas about councils and reform in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, to the point where Luther's defiance of Rome gave these ideas a new and desperate urgency. From then we follow, step by step, the attempts at reconciliation or compromise, the many false starts of the general council, the heart-breaking failures and disappointments. It is a measure of Jedin's skill and understanding that we never lose our way in the conflicts and intrigues of his many *dramatis personæ*. From time to time we may disagree with his judgements. Not everyone will 'detect behind Erasmus's satire . . . the grin of the sceptic'. If 'it is of the very essence of religious revolution that it cannot stop half-way'—though in view of the Lutherans' attitude towards the Anabaptists, this is a highly doubtful generalization—it was equally of the essence of the papacy that it could not advance half-way to meet the doctrinal demands of the reformers. If Luther, as Jedin says, triumphed over Melancthon, it is equally true that Campeggio triumphed over Erasmus. Sometimes the writing is too allusive. What, for instance, was 'Filippo Strozzi's terrible end'?

This first volume takes the story up to 1545. Its stiff price, with several more volumes to come, may seem a heavy investment; but it will be found well worth while for anyone at all interested in the sixteenth century and the history of the Christian Church. The publishers certainly deserve congratulation for their enterprise in making this important work available to English readers in a very handsome form with eight fine plates. The translation is adequate. A really good translation would have had to be much more ruthless with the syntax of the original.<sup>1</sup> But the book remains a most impressive work, and if it is not the definitive work on the Council of Trent—and the subject is so vast and complex that, perhaps happily, a definitive work may never be written about it—it is unlikely to be superseded in our time.

University of Manchester

H. G. KOENIGSBERGER

THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE RUSSIA COMPANY, 1553-1603. By T. S. Willan. Manchester University Press. 1956. x + 295 pp. 30s.

A new, comprehensive history of what many of us most easily call the Muscovy Company during the Tudor period was badly needed. A number of separate studies had covered the ground, with varying degrees of incompleteness, during the past century, but none did so thoroughly. This was especially true of the economic aspects of the Company's activities, where W. R. Scott's treatment (*Joint Stock Companies*, vol. I), valuable as it was in its own time, required to be brought up to date. Dr. Willan's primary objective in this book is to do this and he has taken great pains to show, from scattered and incomplete materials, precisely how the Company was organized during the first fifty years of its existence and what its commercial activities amounted to. Unless there are unsuspected stores of information in the U.S.S.R. it does not seem likely that this part of the Company's history will have to be done again, so thorough has Dr. Willan been. He has had, also, to spend much time and trouble on the diplomatic relations between England and Russia, since the Company was the main reason for there being any relations at all and the principal agent for their maintenance—Queen Elizabeth I did not propose to spend money on embassies or diplomatic bribery when the Company could be made to do it for her. This part of the story is also carefully told, and with some new information, but it clearly does not interest Dr. Willan as much as the purely economic picture and he makes this clear by his somewhat pedestrian treatment. Moreover, such aspects of the Company's work as its sponsorship of exploration and its rôle in mediating Russian civilization to England and English civilization to Russia, though not ignored, are treated somewhat perfunctorily. The total effect of the book is therefore less satisfying than it might be, even though its merits are very substantial.

Economic historians will be specially interested in what Dr. Willan has to say about the contribution of the company to the joint-stock system of finance and organization. He is cautious. The Company was not the pioneer in joint-stock working, but in England such a method of company finance was still experimental. The original joint stock was probably intended to be

<sup>1</sup> On p. 187, 'the party of Duke Ernest' is a mistranslation for the Ernestine line of the Saxon house of Wettin. *Pfalz* should be 'Palatinate', not 'Palatine' (p. 380). *Kachelöfen* which do not exist in this country should, perhaps, be rendered by 'tiled stoves' rather than by the somewhat quaint 'earthenware stoves' (p. 548).



terminable, but was made permanent owing to the special conditions of the trade. Its existence greatly helped the Company to establish itself. New capital was obtained by 'calls' on existing shareholders and this 'may', he says, 'be the earliest example of this method of raising capital in England'. Dealing with defaulters, however, was difficult and was one cause for the substitution of terminable joint stocks in the 'eighties—'in some ways a retrograde step'. The joint-stock form gave the Company an unusual degree of cohesion, but this was gradually lost and the Company became a regulated one shortly after 1620.

Although Dr. Willan gives precise (though often brief) references to his sources in footnotes many of his readers will remain unconvinced by his statement that he regarded a bibliography as unnecessary since it would merely repeat information in the footnotes and 'would have had to describe each separate manuscript if it was to be of any real value. Most of the manuscripts are already described in catalogues (e.g. Lansdowne MSS., Cotton MSS.)'. It is difficult to decide how to take this remark, especially as his footnotes contrive to show that some of the catalogues are wrong! Clearly, what a reader requires to know from a monograph which has pretensions to completeness is firstly, what new sources are used, and secondly, if his own interests lie in the period, whether any scraps he may turn up himself were or were not known to the author. In neither respect will he find Dr. Willan's book as helpful as it might easily have been.

*University of Liverpool*

D. B. QUINN

PORT-ROYAL. ENTRE LE MIRACLE ET L'OBEISSANCE: FLAVIE PASSART ET ANGÉLIQUE DE ST.-JEAN ARNAULD D'ANDILLY. By Jean Orcibal. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer. 1957. 200 pp. 75 fr. belg.

This examination, by an authority on French religious history in the seventeenth century, of the crisis produced in 1664 by the policy of the new archbishop of Paris presupposes familiarity with the literature and personnel of Port-Royal. Flavie Passart was the protagonist of the nuns who accepted the Formulary condemning the Five Propositions, and this study is based upon the account of her given by one of the leaders of the opposed party, Angélique de St.-Jean, the niece of the great Angélique and later herself to be abbess. Flavie's desertion of the extreme Jansenist position for one of blind obedience to the authority of Péréfixe is usually condemned as the fruit of calculated ambition. M. Orcibal's 'psycho-physiological' interpretation of Flavie's frequent illnesses and miraculous recoveries and of her abrupt changes of affection and opinion allows him to argue that she represented, however inadequately, a tradition of humility and silence in Port-Royal to which the intellectual pride and ambition of Angélique de St.-Jean and the second generation of Jansenists were repugnant.

*Wallington County Grammar School for Boys*

H. G. JUDGE

## LATER MODERN

The Enlightenment is in the air again. For the last quarter of a century or more a favourite explanation of contemporary ills has been 'C'est la faute à Voltaire'—or if not Voltaire, then Rousseau, Diderot, Montesquieu, the

*philosophes*, Locke, or indeed the whole trend of European thought since the thirteenth century. On the left, the Enlightenment had fallen into almost equal disrepute as a bourgeois ideology based on such outdated ideas as individualism and liberty: all that was worth doing with it was to search for precursors of Marx, Christians before Christ as one might say. The trouble with such attacks is that sooner or later they lead people to read the authors who are criticized for themselves. Mr. R. V. Sampson has done this in *PROGRESS IN THE AGE OF REASON: THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY TO THE PRESENT DAY* (London: Heinemann, 1957. 259 pp. 21s.); but though his book is interesting and conscientious, it is composed in the pattern set by the brilliant essay, *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-century Philosophers*, of Carl Becker, who has been responsible for more misunderstanding of the eighteenth century than any other writer since Taine, whom Dr. Sampson also quotes with sympathy. It is significant that the greater names of the Enlightenment hardly come into his story of the development of the idea of progress. Dr. Sampson has to rely on such second-rate thinkers as Helvétius Morelly, Mercier, Condorcet, Volney. To trace an idea through a chain of minor writers is, of course, quite legitimate, but to take these as representative of the Enlightenment and argue from them to 'the intellectual sickness of the *ancien régime*' is to put a strain on these weak links that they will not bear. Again, it is only by accepting Cassirer's view of Herder and Kant as the fine flower of the Enlightenment that it is possible to make Hegelianism and Marxism seem its natural sequel.

Dr. Sampson's own views seem to me not so very remote from those that he has quoted earlier, even from Helvétius (*cf.* pp. 54 and 243, 56 and 249). The innocence with which the eighteenth century is charged is not entirely absent when he observes that, 'There is virtual unanimity among human beings today that kindness is preferable to cruelty.' A certain reluctance, in his final discussion of 'moral appraisals' (significant phrase), to recognize the unpleasant may perhaps be traced to the influence of some current views on ethics. Dr. Sampson has written a thoughtful and promising book; but to escape from the limitations of the established pattern it is necessary to go deeper.

The central figure in the history of the Enlightenment is undoubtedly Locke, and now that his papers are at last open to historians we are likely in due course to learn much more about the formation of his ideas. In the meantime Mr. Maurice Cranston has provided in *JOHN LOCKE: A BIOGRAPHY* (London: Longmans, 1957. xvi + 497 pp. 42s.) a detailed, sometimes almost a day-to-day, account of the philosopher's life. Mr. Cranston's thorough and scholarly labours have uncovered many biographical details. If Locke somehow remains at the end an aloof figure, with whom we are acquainted, but whom we feel we hardly know, this is perhaps partly in the character of the man, who had no desire to appear, before either contemporaries or posterity *en pantoufles*. However, it is not as don or doctor, under-cover politician or minor administrator, that Locke matters to us, but as the man who, in Mr. Cranston's words, not merely enlarged men's knowledge, but changed their ways of thinking.

It was the desire to know more about the intellectual milieu out of which the Lockian revolution developed that led Miss R. L. Colie to the researches which she has embodied in *LIGHT AND ENLIGHTENMENT: A STUDY OF THE*

CAMBRIDGE PLATONISTS AND THE DUTCH ARMINIANS (Cambridge University Press. 1957. 162 pp. 20s.). This is well-written, readable (for those who read this kind of thing) and concise. It shows what detailed and perceptive scholarship can contribute to the understanding of the significant controversies of a great period in European thought; and that it *was* great the names of the chief protagonists in a very civilized war of ideas amply indicate—Arminius, Grotius, Limborch, Spinoza from the Dutch republic, Hobbes, Henry More and Cudworth from England, Descartes, Malebranche from France, and the rival popularizers, Le Clerc and Bayle. In the seventeenth century new trends in science and ethics had come together to present anew the theological problem of the nature and scope of divine power. Religion and reason were faced with the problem of compromise and reconciliation, or mutual repudiation. Their answer is revealed in Hazard's classic *La crise de la conscience européenne*, to which Miss Colie's study affords an illuminating introduction.

The sequel is written in the history of eighteenth-century thought. In this field another notable philosophical biography has just appeared. In *DIDEROT: THE TESTING YEARS* (New York: O.U.P. 1957. 417 pp. 63s.) Professor A. M. Wilson gives us a detailed, thoroughly documented and conscientious account of Diderot's life up to the crucial year 1759. His book is both an interesting biography and an important piece of intellectual history, for Diderot was a central figure in the French Enlightenment, and himself, as befitted the editor of the *Encyclopédie*, contributed to more aspects of that movement than anyone else. At the beginning of his career contemplating, or giving the impression that he was contemplating, a clerical vocation, he graduated through deism, the sensational psychology, ethical relativity, mathematics, technology and biological science, musical and artistic theory, to speculations far in advance of his century and masterpieces that were only to be published long after his death. Professor Wilson rightly makes the struggle to publish the *Encyclopédie* the major theme in Diderot's life. He was a born propagandist and it is appropriate that he should be remembered for his achievement of one of the greatest of all works of propaganda. He was also, and this is not so common with propagandists, a notable, if fragmentary, original thinker. His biographer does not merely say this, he makes us understand it, as well as the essentially practical nature of Diderot's reforming thought. Here is no system-maker, no precursor of the nineteenth-century ideologists, but the descendant of a long line of master cutlers of Langres, and the ancestor, through his beloved daughter Angélique, of an industrial dynasty. This first part of his biography is a notable piece of scholarship, in which life and thought are skilfully woven together. The whole will undoubtedly finally take Diderot out of the class of journalist to which Morley had relegated him, and place him among the seminal minds of the eighteenth century.

If the ideas of a man like Diderot had been less concerned with practical developments, the historian might be less interested in them. But the Enlightenment as a whole was practical in the bias of its thought. One of its most far-reaching influences is described by Professor Shelby T. McCloy in *THE HUMANITARIAN MOVEMENT IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE* (University of Kentucky Press. 1957. 274 pp. \$6.50). The intellectual spirit of the Enlightenment lay behind the movements for the abolition of



Protestant and Jewish disabilities, as well as the cessation of actual persecution, for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade, the amelioration of the criminal law, for international peace and for general improvement in public welfare. Mr. McCloy deals with all these topics, though he hardly succeeds in integrating his book or making it more than a collection of useful material. It must also regretfully be asked why an author should devote a great deal of conscientious labour to preparing his subject and so little to the way in which it is written. The English is weak and translations from the French are inadequate.

*University College, London*

ALFRED COBBAN

CUSTOMS LETTER BOOKS OF THE PORT OF LIVERPOOL 1711-1813. By R. C. Jarvis. Manchester University Press: Chetham Society. 1956. xxiv + 192 pp. 35s.

BLUE FUNNEL—A HISTORY OF ALFRED HOLT AND COMPANY OF LIVERPOOL 1865-1914. By F. E. Hyde. Liverpool University Press. 1956. 201 pp. 30s.

Liverpool lost its customs letters by enemy action in 1941, but fortunately the Commissioners had had certain transcripts made, possibly to throw light on their difficulty in getting adequate accommodation in the eighteenth century. It is this collection which is now most competently edited by Mr. Jarvis. Not only will the letters prove of great value to those interested in Liverpool, but they have some claims to the attention of historians. They throw considerable light on the Isle of Man smugglers, of whom the editor has a low opinion, and on Customs administration in general. The valuable glossary of technical terms will help every historian who has to deal with the Customs, at any period. But perhaps the most useful feature of the book is the information it gives of the working of the eighteenth-century civil service. To run a mercantilist system without an army of bureaucrats must have been a difficult problem; and these pages provide part, at any rate, of the answer to the question how it was done. The one criticism of a most valuable work is the absence of a plan of the dock area of Liverpool, which the topographical bias of the original selection of letters makes almost indispensable to the outside reader.

Professor Hyde carries the story of Liverpool into the latter half of the nineteenth century, but the real focus of interest is in the Far East. Indeed one criticism of his book is that it tends to lose sight of the part which the Holt family played in the affairs of Liverpool, not only directly, but through the policy of their firm. The influence of these great shipping houses in local politics is one of the unexplored problems of local history. This said, one has nothing but praise for a remarkably lucid account of the development of the China trade from the days of the tea-race to the early twentieth century. It was a ready appreciation of the changing pattern of Far Eastern trade that built up the fortunes of the Blue Funnel line, and the story is a fascinating one, and makes a book which anyone who has to teach, even in outline, the rise of China, can ill afford to miss.

*University of Hull*

F. W. BROOKS

THE CHATHAM ADMINISTRATION 1766 TO 1768. By John Brooke. London: Macmillan, 1956. xiv + 400 pp. 36s.

The expansion of Sir Lewis Namier's analytical study, *England in the Age of the American Revolution*, into a narrative history of the years 1754 to 1784 has been begun *in medias res* with Mr. John Brooke's study of the years 1766 to 1768. Every combination, every comment, every scheme or suggestion, every project, every wave of opinion or whisper of a politician, for these twenty-six months is subjected to microscopic examination in 300 out of Mr. Brooke's 387 pages. It is a feat of rare scholarship. No single person has ever known before so many political facts of these times—indeed it is to be doubted whether we have such full information for any other patch of political history. Moreover the details may overwhelm but they never bore the reader: for they are set out in a prose style which has a masculine vigour and a cutting edge. Mr. Brooke has a point of view to argue as well as events to chronicle.

Into the middle of his exposition Mr. Brooke inserts some 80 pages of a general thesis on the development of party in the eighteenth century. This is probably as good as any such discussion to which one can direct a student. But it suffers, at present, from the narrowness of the foundations which are visible. The working of the constitution depended much upon circumstances and character. Royal power and party influence ebbed and flowed according to the national situation and to personal peculiarities. It is only when a long period of time is surveyed that the general lines of development become evident. Here we have the story of twenty-six months as our text and a sermon that covers the century. The difficulty of treating party growth or the importance of high policy in this compass is obvious. What is the value of the remark—'Though Rockingham was himself a Whig it was North who inherited both the principles and the personnel of the Pelhams'? The answer will not easily be found in thumbing the pages recording the day to day events of 1766 and 1768. *À propos* of the problems of leadership Mr. Brooke declares that 'Grenville entrenched himself so deep in the Party of the Crown that he was able to take many of its followers with him into opposition'. This remark, following on a discussion of the conversion of office perquisites into personal heirlooms, sounds as if Grenville's importance is to be explained in terms of the mechanics of leadership. What Mr. Brooke probably means is that Grenville's economy budgeting and his stand on America won him lasting respect from independents and men of business alike. This, like his pregnant sentences on the 'critical support' given to government by back-benchers, cannot be fully clarified without the complete and many-volumed exposition of which this is part.

Mr. Brooke has a dislike of the Rockinghams. At every point he discredits them. Rockingham's criticism of Grenville's American policy he holds to arise from accident and obstinacy. When Rockingham refuses to act with Grenville it is explained as a personal dislike rather than a stand on policy. Rockingham appears yet more factious in Mr. Brooke's eyes than he did in those of George III. Even when Rockingham refuses to oppose because to do so would be 'unfair' and 'uncandid' to the Court, this merely earns him blame as a bungling leader. In a desire to correct the fallacious old glorification of the Rockingham group Mr. Brooke seems to go too far, to allow his cleverness as an academic controversialist to cloud his judgement of practical political affairs. When for instance, to controvert Burke, he says that Burke's

'mosaic' speech would fit every administration of the period and that 'It was not Chatham's fault that his Administration was "checkered and speckled"; it was inevitable under eighteenth-century conditions', then Mr. Brooke is in danger of removing the significance from his own drama. Admittedly every administration of the century was composed of heterogeneous elements: was there another so extraordinarily fragmentary as that of Chatham? In these careful pages we see a Chief Minister exalting his right to choose ministers freely from all groups, yet unable to choose intelligently because he had decided to live in isolation; this Minister then refuses to co-ordinate men because he believes he can command events, preferring to trumpet his unpopular views in Parliament rather than to persuade colleagues in Cabinet. In a short time the facts defy him, his colleagues disregard him. If Burke had read Mr. Brooke he would have had even more reason to call it 'a tessellated pavement without cement' or even 'a very curious show'. That the play staggered on, even when the Prince of Denmark had staggered off, is testimony to the sad chaos among the other political groups.

The search for a stable administration in the first decades of George III was beset with difficulty. By 1768 patriotic men despaired but endured, endured almost anything. Nothing else can explain the fact that a substitute for a real minister like Grafton could survive so long. Mr. Brooke's skill in piling up such a wealth of information while always emphasizing this central fact (and stirring up our partisan enthusiasms into the bargain) must whet appetites for his next volume.

*Christ Church, Oxford*

STEVEN WATSON

L'ARTILLERIE DE CAMPAGNE FRANÇAISE PENDANT LES GUERRES DE LA RÉVOLUTION: ÉVOLUTION DE L'ORGANISATION ET DE LA TACTIQUE.

By M. Lauerma. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia. 1956. 349 pp. 1300 mk.

This book tells its highly important story well, in plain, dispassionate, non-picturesque language. The artillery, with its 'loyalty to the gun' and necessity for technical training, was the Praetorian Guard of the Revolution. The author traces the origin and development of this élite and highly professional arm. The French field and horse artillery of the Revolution multiplied at the expense of heavy guns and battalion pieces; it was flexible, highly mobile and swift in effect, an important means of bringing extra pressure on a selected portion of the enemy's line. There was nothing particularly novel about French technical developments; only in intelligence, energy and enthusiasm did they excel; never, even at the most critical moments, did they neglect careful officer-education; and in the end their enemies copied so astutely their methods that in 1813 they were level with them. An independent artillery joined the cavalry and infantry in all armies as an integral part of division and army corps, used specially in attack and employing concentrated fire.

About a third of the book treats of pre-revolutionary artillery in Europe, noting especially the effect of the American War; the main part includes many battle-diagrams; Bonaparte has two of the twelve chapters to himself, being seen as both cause and effect, with an inspired ability to use what was available; and the final pages comment on later developments. There are useful itemized chapter sub-headings but no index. The author has consulted



a wide range of printed and secondary sources, most of them French, some German, and uses them skilfully in careful analysis of strengths, types of guns, transport, training and theoretical arguments. For British figures, Fortescue is quoted; a pity, for Lt.-Col. Laws' *Battery Records* (1952) is much more reliable. The general effect of M. Lauerman's study, drawing together so many threads and weaving such a novel picture, is impressive.

*Cherrywood School, Birmingham*

T. H. MCGUFFIE

THE TROUBLE MAKERS: DISSENT OVER FOREIGN POLICY 1792-1939. By

A. J. P. Taylor. London: Hamish Hamilton. 1957. 207 pp. 18s.

This is a rollicking book. One can envy the enjoyment of those who heard it in its original form as the Ford Lectures for 1956 and listened to its Chestertonian mixture of wisdom, shrewdness, honesty, prejudice and extravagance. At times Mr. Taylor is a detached, almost an icy, observer of the gyrations of human kind and an outspoken critic of those historians who would be more. 'How can we decide', he asks, 'about something that did not happen? Heaven knows, we have difficulty enough in deciding what did happen.' Hastening to agree with this salutary observation the reader is then embarrassed by the assertion that 'Fox would have run the war a great deal better than Pitt' and 'might have become a great War Minister' or is induced to speculate on what Gladstone might have achieved if he had been the leader of the Labour Party in 1938. 'In my opinion', Mr. Taylor says sternly, 'we learn nothing from history except the infinite variety of men's behaviour'; and he is amusingly caustic at the expense of the historians who took part in the political campaign over the Bulgarian Horrors. But is there not something didactically emotional, something beyond mere courage and erudition, in the description of *The Rights of Man* as 'the greatest political disquisition written by an Englishman'; of Cobden as 'the most powerful reasoner who has ever applied himself to practical politics'; of Warren Hastings curtly written off as 'the notorious plunderer'; and of Tel-el-Kebir as the mere butchery of 'some wretched Egyptian peasants'? This last statement would have surprised the men who fought there, on either side; as much as the information that they live on the north-east coast may surprise the inhabitants of Darlington.

The half-truth, sometimes useful to a lecturer or broadcaster who seeks an apt illustration or wishes to ram a point home, does not invariably look at its best in sober print afterwards. This does not mean that one would willingly have missed the description of Gladstone as 'Sir Robert Peel and Feargus O'Connor rolled into one': it may be exiguous but there have been many descriptions of Gladstone further from the truth—whatever the truth was. The contrast between the romantically-minded Lancashire millowners and merchants, 'patrons of Chopin and Liszt, readers of Tennyson, gambling in cotton futures' and their sober, rational employees is an entrancing one. But in so far as it is based on or leads to the assertion that the public-house (by contrast with the gullible Stock Exchange) is 'the home of common sense' it loses its force. The sober, rational Victorian working-man used the public-house very little: he usually left it to the other half of the working-class, who used it a great deal. As for the common sense to be found in public-houses today, I have heard too many fantastic doubles and trebles seriously discussed in them and have tried too many housebreakers whose

idiotic schemes had been laboriously and expensively hatched in them to be convinced that more irrational thinking is possible, even on the Stock Exchange.

When the half-truth is moved from the field of social observation and personal experience to that of historical fact it is less reputable. In speaking of the mid-Victorian period Mr. Taylor says that 'the member of parliament could follow his own bent, act according to his own judgement'. This is a considerable exaggeration. Then he goes on to say that 'every government between 1835 and 1874 fell because of defeat in an existing House of Commons, not because of defeat at the polls'. This is not even literally true because Disraeli resigned in December 1868 as a consequence of the Conservative defeat at the polls. It is more important, however, to notice that what Mr. Taylor says here masks the fact that some governments in this period were defeated in the House of Commons *because* they had recently been defeated or had not done well enough at the polls. This was the case with the Whigs in 1841 and with the Conservatives in 1852 and 1859: in 1857 the verdict of the polls restored Palmerston to the position of which the House of Commons had sought to deprive him. The system which obtained between 1835 and 1874 was not that which obtains now; but neither was it that which obtained in the eighteenth century or 'what we now call derogatorily "the French system" '.

This is not merely a 'frivolous intellectual aside' (to quote Mr. Taylor's over-modest description of his own deft and apposite remarks on the Positivists): it is one of the factors which may cause a reader to examine the main thesis of this book with caution as well as with anticipation. In fact the caution is scarcely called for. What Mr. Taylor is anxious to challenge is the thesis that there has been a British foreign policy transcending party differences; what he is anxious to convince us of is that such policy has always been the subject of disagreement and controversy. Few academic teachers, one would have thought, could nowadays be justifiably reproached with such blindness. But it may (or may not) be salutary for them to read about one special kind of critic, from Fox, through Urquhart and Cobden, to E. D. Morel. These Mr. Taylor calls the Dissenters. Moving along a difficult but yet tangible line he would exclude occasional critics—Salisbury as a critic of Palmerston, Sir Winston Churchill as a critic of Neville Chamberlain—and he concentrates upon those who repudiated the aims, the methods, the principles of British foreign policy; who were contemptuous of those in authority. What he is anxious to prove is that Dissent (in his meaning of it) was not a mere centrifugal activity of unimportant cranks but a force which almost invariably altered policy in the future and has been vindicated if not by historians at least by posterity. 'If you want to know what the foreign policy of this country will be in twenty or thirty years' time, find out what the Dissenting minority are saying now. The policy being applied will be their policy—maybe at the wrong time and in the wrong way, certainly to a chorus of Dissenting disapproval.' It is not clear that Urquhart achieved much success or that British foreign policy in the 'nineties was that of Cobden as, by Mr. Taylor's argument, it ought to have been: on the other hand, as Mr. Taylor justly points out, the 'Dissenting' reaction against the Versailles Treaty was decisively effective. It may be that Mr. Taylor, in the course of his declared attempt 'to tilt the scales a bit the other way' has tilted them

a good deal too far. It may well be that the business of the historian is not the tilting of scales. But if there has to be tilting it could hardly be done more amusingly or more interestingly than it has been done in this book.

*King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne*

W. L. BURN

ENGLISH HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS. Vol. XII (1), 1833-74. Edited by G. M. Young and A. D. Handcock. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1956. xxiv + 1017 pp. 95s.

The editors of this volume have discharged their Herculean labours with thoroughness and skill. Faced with an embarrassment of riches in this the golden age of the Royal Commission and its attendant Blue Book, they have contrived a valuable work of reference for the teacher and scholar, and, still more, a stimulating introduction to the sources of English nineteenth-century history for the enterprising student. Each of the volume's twelve sections carries its own well-balanced introductory essay, and the bibliographies, though not without errors of detail, should serve the student well. No doubt every reader will have his own private grievance—of documents omitted or topics given more or less than their proper deserts—but in general the editors would seem to have had a good eye for the significant and to have struck a happy balance in the allocation of the space at their disposal.

A more legitimate criticism relates not to the subject but to the nature of the documents selected for reproduction. Almost without exception the 269 documents are of a governmental or official character. The result is a volume which reflects history as seen through the eyes of Westminster and Whitehall, revealed in Hansard, the Parliamentary Papers and the correspondence of royalty, and illustrating primarily those aspects of life which are the concern of legislators and civil servants. Nineteenth-century history thus perceived lacks a significant dimension, as readers of Dr. Young's own *Victorian England: Portrait of an Age* or Professor Briggs' *Victorian Portraits* will readily appreciate; for this was not only the classical age of the House of Commons but also the great age of provincial England—of Cobden's Manchester and Chamberlain's Birmingham. It is a pity, therefore, that the provincial press is here entirely neglected, while local government and the poor law are served, albeit handsomely, only by central government documents. A volume, which has as one of its primary *raison d'être* the introduction of the young historian to the materials of his craft, could with advantage give him wider glimpses of his promised land. But to end on a note of criticism, however valid, would do ill-justice to a notable work. It is good to know that the further volume of Victorian documents is in such able and practiced hands.

*University College, London*

A. J. TAYLOR

GENERAL T. PERRONET THOMPSON 1783-1869: HIS MILITARY, LITERARY AND POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS. By L. G. Johnson. London: Allen and Unwin. 1957. 294 pp. 30s.

Few public men of the nineteenth century had such a varied career as the subject of this book. The son of an Evangelical Hull merchant, he served first in the navy and then in the army. Captured in the unfortunate Buenos Ayres expedition in 1807, he was later, through his Evangelical connections, made Governor of Sierra Leone. He served in Wellington's invasion of



France in 1813-14, then in India, and was court-martialled after an unsuccessful action against the Arabs on the shores of the Persian Gulf. After his return to England in 1823, he became acquainted, through his interest in European Liberalism, with John Bowring, and thus with Bentham and the Benthamite circle. Though he continued to climb the ladder of military promotion, he did no more soldiering, but became an active Radical politician. He was, for several years, editor of the *Westminster Review*; he was an early assailant of the Corn Laws; he was connected with the group which produced the People's Charter; he sat in the Commons as M.P. for Hull and later for Bradford, and was a copious writer on political subjects.

Mr. Johnson's book gives an interesting account of a life which, in the author's words, 'strikingly expresses the vitality and versatility of the England of his day'. Thompson must have been a difficult, contentious man, an individualist of the type which finds it hard to attain success in politics. The particular interest of his career lies both in his connections with Evangelicalism and in his double rôle both as soldier and as reformer. A valuable study might be written on the subsequent careers of the British officers of the Napoleonic war. The jurist, John Austin, was one of them; Charles Rowan, one of the first Commissioners of Metropolitan Police, was another. Much of the energy which, before 1815, had gone into defeating the king's enemies went later into reforming the law and improving the administration under which the king's subjects lived. Mr. Johnson is rather indiscriminating in his use of the words 'Methodist' and 'Evangelical' with the result that his treatment of the religious background lacks clarity. The name of the philanthropist Fowell Buxton is incorrectly given as 'Fowler Buxton'. More emphasis might have been laid on the fact that Thompson was elected a fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge, while serving as a midshipman; there can be few others who have doubled the two parts.

*Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*

JOHN ROACH

THE POLITICS OF ENGLISH DISSENT. By Raymond G. Cowherd. New York University Press. 1956. 242 pp. \$5.

As its sub-title indicates this book deals with 'the Religious Aspects of Liberal and Humanitarian Reform Movements from 1815 to 1848'. Methodists, Church Evangelicals, and Dissenters are generally presented as children of light; the rest, particularly High Churchmen, as children of darkness. Hence the author experiences some embarrassment in dealing with the attitudes of Radical Dissenters to factory reform, when the 'Liberal' and the 'Humanitarian' did not apparently coincide. An English reader cannot but feel that this book misses many of the *nuances* of the subject, and in particular that the Dissenters are dealt with too much in a lump, regardless of the varieties amongst them. The influence of Wesley is greatly overrated, important though it was. Indeed what Mr. Cowherd calls 'the Wesleyan doctrine of salvation' was, in some points at least, rejected by most Dissenters and Church Evangelicals. There are some errors of detail perhaps worth noting. The Corporation Act did not altogether in practice succeed in excluding Dissenters from local government in the towns, for its teeth were pulled by the Act of 1718 for Quietting Corporations, there was some variety of local practice, and the Statutory *ad hoc* Authorities increasingly took over the management of the towns. Nor did the Test Act of 1678 exclude Dissenters

from the House of Commons: (it did not exclude William Smith, M.P.). In an interesting suggestion, Mr. Cowherd finds the origin of the Liberal Party in the turning of the Dissenters away from their old alliance with the Whigs to the Radicals, as shown in 1837 in Miall's *The Nonconformist*, and the setting up in the election of 1847 of anti-Whig Dissenting candidates. This idea, though interesting, is not exhaustive, for clearly the Liberal party had no one 'origin', nor did it consist wholly of Radicals and Dissenters. Seeing that the educational controversies were so important, Mr. Cowherd would have been helped by W. F. Connell's *The Educational Thought and Influence of Matthew Arnold*, and for the general Radical-Dissenting agitation for dis-establishment by A. T. Patterson's *Radical Leicester*, neither of which appear in his bibliography.

Bedford College, London

R. W. GREAVES

POLISH POLITICS AND THE REVOLUTION OF 1830. By R. F. Leslie. London:

Athlone Press. 1956. xii + 307 pp. 37s. 6d.

The appearance of a substantial work on Polish history is an event of importance in this country. The re-establishment of the Poles as an important European people in the present century means that we must, belatedly it is true, study seriously their history. Apart from the *Cambridge History of Poland*, which is really a series of short articles, this is the first lengthy work in English on a period of Polish history. In writing it the author has triumphed over many obstacles. He has succeeded in getting access to most of the sources at a time when many are scarce and scattered through the effects of war and revolution. He is to be congratulated on the excellent use he has made of them.

Under its rather strange title the book is an account of the events which led to the revolution of 1830, of the war with Russia and the failure of the Poles. The most solid part of the work is the admirable account of the economic problems of the peasants and the gentry on pp. 51-95, which is no mere summing up of Polish research but an independent and resolute extraction of the facts from the documents. As regards the revolution and the war the author finds his way through the very conflicting views of tangled events by examining most of the authorities for himself, laying great stress on the failure on the part of the Poles to achieve the agrarian reforms which might have rallied the mass of the peasants to the revolution. The account of the whole period is lucid, accurate and readable.

The part of the book which might be criticized is the introductory account of Polish institutions—not that it is incorrect in detail, but because a short introduction has inevitable weaknesses. In this case it implies the awakening of a people from stagnation and weakness, and their failure in a certain period to achieve complete recovery, without any hint that they had a past record of great constitutional and social invention and achievement, which would inevitably lead one to understand their survival against very unusual obstacles. The second criticism that might be made is that the author's sympathies are so strongly set on social reforms that he underrates the importance of national liberty, as when he says that the Poles would have been better off under Russia than under such men as Prince Adam Czarrtoryski. There are many passages that there is little space to welcome, e.g. the account of the problem of the Emigration and the Russian attitude after

the Revolution. We must pay tribute to the excellent bibliography, the impeccable writing of Polish names and welcome the news in the Preface that this admirable work is to be followed by others.

A. BRUCE BOSWELL

Professor A. L. Burt has already demonstrated his facility for vivid writing in other general histories, and now he has written in *THE EVOLUTION OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND COMMONWEALTH* (London: Harrap. 1957. 950 pp. 50s.) a long history of the Commonwealth since the days of the American secession which should command attention. This study is happily free from the usual mass of detail and is distinguished by lively comment and argument, by its use of Irish parallels, and by its integration of the domestic history of Britain. He takes the liberal view of the intentions of the Quebec Act and the conservative view of the purposes of the New South Wales settlement. With some reason he suspects the constitutional nature of French-Canadian arguments against the Canada Act, though he perpetuates the error that *Le Canadien* began in 1806 with a defiant nationalist motto. Despite mention of Professor Namier's work in his bibliography, a Whig view of George III and the significance of 1783-4 persists. He would seem to underestimate Shelburne, to over-emphasize the immediate effects of 1832, to exaggerate Wakefield's personal contribution, to attribute too great a clarity to Durham's advocacy of responsible government, without indicating the metropolitan confusion in cabinet practice during the same period, and to label too glibly the period of anti-imperialism and imperialism around the misleading watershed of the Crystal Palace speech. At times the style is involved, the sense obscure, the images too fanciful, and the comment irrelevant to his main thesis: his tribute to Mahan, or his remark on the Channel as 'the grandmother of parliaments', for example. But these are irritating flaws in what is essentially an able and readable account of an important theme. T. G. Wilson's pamphlet, *THE RISE OF THE NEW ZEALAND LIBERAL PARTY 1880-90* (Auckland University College. 1956. 42 pp. 4s.), traces competently the resurrection of a Liberal philosophy akin to state socialism and of a Liberal party from a state of collapse under Grey to power under Ballance and Seddon, when conservatism and provincialism were found wanting. J. D. B. Miller's contribution to the Institute of Commonwealth Studies occasional papers—*RICHARD JEBB AND THE PROBLEM OF EMPIRE* (London: Athlone Press. 1956. 48 pp. 4s. 6d.)—is too partial and over-emphatic to convince. Though he adds little to our knowledge he establishes a case in his conclusion for a re-consideration of Jebb's understanding of the nature of colonial nationalism.

*Rhodes House, Oxford*

A. F. McC. MADDEN

*TRADE AND POLITICS IN THE NIGER DELTA 1830-1895.* By K. O. Diké. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1956. 250 pp. 30s.

This is a most welcome addition to studies in West African history, which it is to be hoped initiates a new series interpreting the life of a territory with which England has long been connected. Dr. Diké is unusually well qualified to undertake such a study: he has been trained in European standards of historical scholarship; he understands the Nigerian peoples and their institutions, he has made full use of English sources and has an unrivalled



knowledge of the record material in Nigeria. The subject and the writer are well met.

Dr. Diké has chosen for this book a period lying between the English abolition of the slave trade and the Berlin Conference of 1884, a time when policy from the European side was hesitant. The central chapters deal with the effects of the interplay between English and African interests in the middle years of the century. Dr. Diké re-assesses the work of John Beecroft, the consul appointed in 1849, and emphasizes the importance and strength of the Delta city-states, and of the trading organizations of the region in the period when the oil trade was beginning to displace the trade in men. His conclusions are a useful reminder to English readers that initiative in Anglo-African commerce was not the monopoly of the visiting traders, as the African states could and did tenaciously pursue policies dictated by their own needs.

The story is told graphically and carries the reader with interest through the intricacies of Delta politics. Dr. Diké's gift for narrative is probably best seen in Chapter X on the rise of JaJa of Opobo. The central figure of JaJa is most skilfully brought to life, and Niger warfare and trade are vividly described.

Dr. Diké is a bold historian and presents his conclusions decisively, but in Chapter I on 'The pattern of West African Trade and Politics 1481-1830', he is regrettably cautious. In the centuries-wide sweep of his introduction he has arranged a pattern against which his main theme is set. The validity of this pattern depends on his historical acumen in making generalizations about four hundred years of trade and politics. The chapter is, however, weighted down by references to a most formidable array of monographs, general histories and narratives on which he draws. Here Dr. Diké's caution is at fault, as the extracts do not in fact strengthen his argument. Some of the quotations are inadequate to support the conclusions drawn from them, and others do not fully represent the views of the writers from whose books they are taken.

At the other end of the book the situation is reversed, in the 'Notes on Sources'. Here there is a wisely brief bibliography and a tantalizingly brief account of the African material which has been used, and which Dr. Diké has done so much to collect and to preserve.

*Westfield College, London*

EVELINE MARTIN

THE EMERGENCE OF RUSSIAN PANSLAVISM, 1856-1870. By Michael Boro Petrovich. Columbia University Press. London: O.U.P. 1956. xiv + 312 pp. 45s.

SIBERIA AND THE REFORMS OF 1822. By Marc Raeff. Seattle: University of Washington Press. 1956. xvii + 210 pp. \$3.50.

DAS SOWJETISCHE REGIERUNGSSYSTEM. By W. Grottian. Köln u. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag. 1956. Leitfaden 175 pp., Quellenbuch 170 pp. DM.13.80.

THE NORTHERN SEA ROUTE AND THE ECONOMY OF THE SOVIET NORTH. By Constantine Krypton. London: Methuen. 1956. 219 pp. 21s.

SOVIET AFFAIRS. St. Antony's Papers Number 1. London: Chatto and Windus. 1956. 147 pp. 12s. 6d.

Whilst no work on Russian history published in the West can completely

escape the consequences of our inability to consult Soviet libraries and archives, much can be achieved by the judicious use of available material. Several recent publications, covering a variety of topics, illustrate the manner in which the inevitable handicap can be partially overcome.

Dr. Petrovich in his study of early Russian panslavism is able to draw extensively on the published works of its exponents and on previous literature about them. The result is a highly successful description of early panslav ideology and organization. It shows how the moderate theories of the slavophiles became transformed into the harsher panslav doctrines, which ended by becoming the vehicle of militant Russian imperialism. Dr. Petrovich's researches confirm the accepted view that the influence of panslavism on Russian foreign policy was exaggerated abroad. The creation of a group of professors, publicists and political journalists, it had little effective support. The illiterate masses were almost completely impervious to panslav propaganda. With few exceptions, officialdom and the upper classes generally were indifferent. Nicholas I and Alexander II were unsympathetic. The main political asset of the panslavs consisted of a group of pious ladies surrounding the empress Marie, but during the period studied their political influence was negligible. Nor were Russian panslav doctrines acceptable to the non-Russian Slavs. The age-old hatred of Pole and Muscovite made nonsense of talk about Slav brotherhood and solidarity. The southern and western Slavs soon perceived the cloven hoof under the cloak of Russian Slav idealism. Dr. Petrovich gives a full and illuminating account of the Moscow Slav Congress of 1867. A weakness in an otherwise admirable work is the absence of any attempt to discuss the relations of the panslavs with Michael Katkov, the influential journalist and apostle of Great Russian chauvinism. In spite of this, Dr. Petrovich's detailed study deserves to rank with Hans Kohn's broader and more general study, which it usefully supplements.

Dr. Raeff is less well served by his material. He recognizes the fact when he writes that 'as long as direct search in Russia is impossible, we can study Russian local and regional history only through the materials of the central government'. In fact, Dr. Raeff uses as his main source the printed collection of Russian laws and the archives of the Imperial Council. The results achieved are not entirely satisfactory. There may have been in 1822, as Dr. Raeff asserts, substantial paper changes with regard to Siberian administration. Alexander Herzen, at least, maintains that within a few years of these reforms, the administration of Siberia was exactly what it had been before.

Professor Grottian succeeds with material which is, on the face of it, unpromising. He makes extensive use of the works of Lenin and Stalin, of the Soviet press and publications and of the earlier work of American scholars. With the help of this material, he is able to present a convincing account of the evolution of Soviet political organization. Interesting light is thrown on the extent to which the later 'Stalinism' was already inherent in Lenin's doctrines and administrative practices. The administrative background to Stalin's dictatorship is lucidly analysed. The scope of the work may be gathered from a brief survey of its contents. The opening part discusses the objectives and tactics of the Russian Communist Party and their translation into forms of political organization. The first half of the second, more specific, section is devoted to the Communist Party, its position in the Soviet State, the shifts of power within it, and its size and social composition. This is fol-

lowed by a description of other instruments serving the purposes of the Soviet leadership: the state police, the armed forces, economic planning and Soviet Democracy. The work consists of a guide and a source book. The two admirably supplement each other. Professor Grottian's work is of interest to anyone wishing to study the basis of power in the Soviet Union.

Constantine Krypton's monograph is based on material of a different nature. The author, formerly the highest official concerned with economic research on the Soviet north, had access to much material obtained from responsible officials and the files of administrative institutions. As he was able to take his notes with him to the United States, he writes with authority. His work, although in the main technical and of interest only to the specialist, throws interesting light on the clash in Soviet planning between political and economic objectives.

Every student of Soviet affairs will welcome the appearance of the volume from St. Antony's College, Oxford. It contains contributions on such varied topics as the Cheka, Siberian Partisans in the Civil War, Economics in the U.S.S.R., the Russians and the East German Party, New Trends in Soviet Policy towards Islam and life in a Soviet Isolator. One of the contributions is of outstanding interest even to the non-specialist. Entitled 'The Ideological Functionary' it deals with the training of Communist Party officials at higher Party colleges. The author, himself a former instructor at one of these colleges, left Eastern Germany for Belgrade in 1949. His remarks on the kind of doubt felt by party functionaries and on the disintegrating effects of 'titoism' are of absorbing interest.

*University of Glasgow*

W. E. MOSSE

Mr. Abraham Yeselson, in his book *UNITED STATES-PERSIAN DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS 1883-1921* (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press. 1956. 252 pp. 37s. 6d.), draws on the National Archives at Washington, D.C. to produce an interesting if at times repetitive narrative. Unfortunately he seems to have no other manuscript sources. Mr. Yeselson claims 'to assess the effects in Persia of the over-all foreign policy approaches of the various administrations' with special reference to Presidents Taft, Roosevelt and Wilson. Yet he has apparently not so much as looked at their private papers in the Library of Congress. The work as a whole suffers from the author's heavy reliance on American authorities for a period for which in Persian studies there is little American scholarship and in which State Department policy was, as we are told in this book too many times, one of non-involvement or non-intervention. According to Mr. Yeselson, 'America's unwillingness to become entangled in the dangerous politics of Persia was a primary reason for Persia's high regard for the United States'. He believes that 'America's reputation for high-minded disinterestedness is an asset which should be retained'. But he does not tell us how to do this now that the traditional policy of non-involvement is out of date. In summing up the official State Department attitude towards Persia Mr. Yeselson has accomplished his main objective. Of Persia itself, and of the real foreign impact there—from Russia and Great Britain—we learn very little. The practice of breaking up the text by headlines which would seem more suitable in a popular newspaper is hardly becoming in a scholarly work.

*Bedford College, London*

ROSE LOUISE GREAVES



An important contribution to recent Russian history is Bertram D. Wolfe's *THREE WHO MADE A REVOLUTION* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1956. x + 661 pp. 30s.), a British edition of a book first published in the U.S.A. in 1948. It interweaves the life stories of Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin from their early years to 1914, and uses them as a framework for the first detailed account in English of the Russian Social Democratic movement from its origins to the outbreak of the First World War. It is based on thorough and careful research into the available printed sources, some of which must have been very hard to locate, and it does as much as any single book could to show the extent to which Soviet writers of the Stalinist era have falsified and distorted even the early history of Russian Social Democracy. It is written throughout in a lively and vigorous style which does not falter even when recounting the endless but illuminating conflicts and squabbles among the various Social Democratic groups in the years immediately before 1914 when they reached their nadir after the exaggerated hopes of 1905-7. It should certainly be read and studied by all those who are specially interested in Russian and Soviet history and in the history of modern revolutionary movements. But it can also be recommended to historians with different interests as a book which will help to give them a much better understanding of Communist policy not only before but since the October Revolution of 1917.

*School of Slavonic Studies, London* G. H. BOLSOVER

*RUSSIA LEAVES THE WAR.* By George Kennan. London: Faber, 1956. xiii + 544 pp. 50s.

This first volume of Professor Kennan's study of Soviet-American relations from 1917 to 1921 covers the months from the November Revolution 1917 to the Brest-Litovsk Treaty of March 1918. It is not quite as little-known a story as many of his reviewers have suggested: but until his book appeared it had to be laboriously pieced together from many sources—like the U.S. series *Foreign Relations*, the Cumming and Pettit *Documents*, Bruce Lockhart's sketchy autobiography, and scholarly narratives like those of Mr. Wheeler-Bennett and Professor W. A. Williams. In Mr. Kennan's hands, this story becomes a vivid and detailed account of these months of extraordinary confusion; it is told with style and judgement, and it is shot through not only by his own knowledge of the places and the documents but by his sharp comments out of his own, not dissimilar, diplomatic experience. Here again, neither for the first nor the last time, one suspects, is a story of Presidential indecision, with a President no longer at the top of his powers, living in a world of self-made liberal illusions; a Department of State torn by personal feuds and by conflicting evidence; with too many men on the spot, most of them ignorant, self-centred and over-assured of their own wisdom.

Professor Kennan gives a brilliant and restrained account of the *dramatis personæ*. He is kinder to Lansing than is customary, and noticeably tolerant towards Ambassador Francis: though he cannot deny his naïveté, at least he rescues him from the more venomous charges to which the *de Cram affaire* gave rise. He discovers a delightful negro servant of Francis's, Philip Jordan, with a talent for frank comment on the strange scene ('these crazy people are killing each other just like we swat flies at home . . . After living in a wild country like this for 18 months it makes you feel their [*sic*] is only two decent places to live one is heaven and the other is America . . .').

Bullard's, he believes, was 'the best American mind observing on the spot the course of the Russian Revolution'; he is less sympathetic to Thompson and Robins than previous estimates have been, largely from a distrust of amateur diplomacy. Certainly he makes it plain that this was as responsible as Wilson's rigidity for the bungling of American-Soviet relations; and yet Robins and Gumberg, alone among Western agents, acquired some influence upon the Bolshevik leaders. The real failure was a failure of ideas: Wilson and Lenin, surely better equipped than most American and Russian leaders to understand political ideas, never really understood each other's.

Professor Kennan devotes considerable space to the 'Sisson Documents', which Sisson of the Creel Committee believed to have been stolen from the Bolshevik headquarters, and which he, and the State Department, published as evidence of a long collusion between Lenin and the Germans. Many on the spot accepted these fantastic charges. Mr. Kennan dismisses almost all the documents as 'forgeries from beginning to end'. But published in America, they destroyed what little chance existed of the sober appreciation of Russia, or of Bolshevism. And, as Mr. Kennan admits, 'it was Robins, the vague and exalted enthusiast, whose understanding was closest to the truth, and Sisson, the sharp and zealous war-worker, who lost himself in a forest of delusion . . .' It was not only Sisson, or American public opinion, that was lost in this forest in 1917-18. It was in its tangled undergrowth—through which Mr. Kennan moves so easily—that so many dangerous illusions of our own generation grew.

*University of Glasgow*

ESMOND WRIGHT

The publication of the *CORRESPONDANCE SECRÈTE DU COMTE DE BROGLIE AVEC LOUIS XV (1756-1774)* by D. Ozanam and M. Antoine (Tome I, 1756-66. Paris: Société de l'histoire de France. 1956. cxiv + 392 pp. 3000 fr.) revives once more doubts whether the collections of documents that are published are always worth the trouble, especially when they are, as in this case, the record of tiresome and trivial diplomatic intrigues. On the other hand, it must be said that these letters have been edited with the most patient and thorough scholarship and that the notes are a good deal more rewarding than the text. Above all, this edition has provided the stimulus for a lucid and masterly introduction of 114 pages, in which the editors have brought out for the first time in full detail, and traced from beginning to end, the *secret du roi*—that system of private and unofficial diplomacy, independent of and often in contradiction with his official policy, to which Louis XV devoted so much time and toil.

To the *Pelican History of the World*, in which there are so far histories of Modern China and the United States, has been added the first volume of *A HISTORY OF MODERN FRANCE: OLD RÉGIME AND REVOLUTION 1715-1799* (London: Penguin Books. 1957. 287 pp. 3s. 6d.) by A. Cobban.

*A NOTE-BOOK OF EDMUND BURKE* (Cambridge University Press. 1957. xii + 120 pp. 18s. 6d.) is the first full publication of a set of poems and essays composed by Edmund Burke in his early years in England, or by his 'cousin' William Burke. Its editor, H. V. F. Somerset, discusses in his introduction, mainly on literary grounds, to which of the two each separate piece should be attributed.

Major S. J. Watson's *BY COMMAND OF THE EMPEROR* (London: The Bodley Head. 1957. 236 pp. 25s.) is a readable biography of Marshal Berthier, Napoleon's Chief-of-Staff. Though there are occasional references, the book is too lacking in indication of its sources to be of much use to the historian. *MISS HOWARD AND THE EMPEROR* (London: Collins. 1957. 224 pp. 18s.) by Simone André Maurois, translated by H. Hare, increases our knowledge of the life and personality of Louis Napoleon's beautiful and unfortunate mistress, and adds Julie Castlenau, later Lady Wallace, for good measure. Apart from some incidental and not very favourable light it throws on the characters of Napoleon III and the Empress Eugénie it has little historical significance.

Taine's *NOTES ON ENGLAND* (London: Thames and Hudson. 1957. 296 pp. 25s.) have been brightly translated and provided with an introduction and illustrations from contemporary comic artists by E. Hyams. Like everything that Taine wrote, his views on England consist of brilliant, penetrating half-truths.

One has only to look at any illustrated school text-book to see the influence of *Punch* on history. A single cartoon sums up the view of the nation in pithy and pointed form. This is helpful for teaching, and also dangerous. One of the virtues of the detailed, conscientious and interesting book, *A HISTORY OF PUNCH* (London: Collins. 1957. 384 pp. Illus. 30s.) by R. G. G. Price, is that it reveals the individuals behind what is sometimes treated as though it were an impersonal institution. Like *The Times*, *Punch* has been a voice, but not necessarily *the* voice of the nation.

The second volume of *THE HOLSTEIN DIARIES*, edited by Norman Rich and M. H. Fisher (Cambridge University Press. 1957. xix + 404 pp. 45s.) has been published, along with the German edition (*Die Geheimen papiere Friedrich von Holstein* (Göttingen: Musterschmidt. xx + 442 pp. DM. 32.80)). It shows the German foreign ministry and court through the somewhat peculiar eyes of Holstein from 1882 to 1888.

Serious students of African history should respond sharply to Heinrich Schiffer's *THE QUEST FOR AFRICA—TWO THOUSAND YEARS OF EXPLORATION* (London: Odhams Press. 1957. 352 pp. 25s.). It is too informal and anecdotal to supply the need for a readable but scholarly one-volume account of the opening-up of Africa. Its sensational style is matched by the lurid and careless manner in which it is presented by the publishers: for example, there are three maps of Victoria Nyanza but not one of Africa as a whole; H. M. Stanley's well-known features appear above the name of Georg Schweinfurth and *vice versa*. Its account of German exploration, which might have been of value for English readers, is undocumented, and so little real worth to the serious student.

From Switzerland come two useful short diplomatic studies of British foreign policy in the Bismarck era. *DIE DIPLOMATISCHEN BEZIEHUNGEN ZWISCHEN ENGLAND UND DER SCHWEIZ VON 1870 BIS 1890* (Basel u. Stuttgart: Helbing u. Lichtenstein. 1956. 228 pp. Fr. 12.45) by Lotti Genner, is mainly evidence of how much can happen without surface excitement. *ENGLAND UND DIE EUROPÄISCHEN MÄCHTE IM JAHRE 1887* (Aarau: Sauerländer. 1957. 153 pp.) by Klaus Römer, is a study of a great year of crisis; it badly needed re-examination, and Dr. Römer has done this briefly and judiciously, with a good deal of new material.



IZLAZAK SRBIJE NA JADRANSKO MORE I KONFERENCIJA AMBASADORA U LONDONU 1912, by D. Djordjevic (Belgrade. 1956. 160 pp. 350 dinars) is the latest contribution to one of the most important episodes in the struggle between Austria-Hungary and Serbia in the years before the First World War. It deals with Serbia's attempt to obtain an outlet to the Adriatic through northern Albania. The Ballplatz thwarted this move and its views prevailed at the conference of ambassadors in London. It is a complex story that emerges, not different in outline from that already known, but made the more convincing by the weight of new evidence that the author brings to support it.

## THE AMERICAS

It was an excellent idea to include in the *Textes Littéraires Français* Dr. Theodore Besterman's edition of *LES RELATIONS DE CE QUI S'EST PASSÉ AU PAYS DES HURONS*, by Jean de Brébeuf (Geneva: Droz. 1957. xxvii + 229 pp. 12 Sw. fr.), hitherto available only in an expensive edition in English. Brébeuf, from 1623 until his death at the hands of the Iroquois in 1649, was one of the greatest French Jesuit missionaries. The importance of his contribution, in the *Relations* of 1635 and 1636, here reprinted, to North America ethnology can scarcely be over-emphasized. They reveal how a born observer, with a dedicated patience, could uncover the primitive life of the Hurons with a simplicity and clarity which makes his reports of substantial literary value. To them Dr. Besterman has added a number of letters (some translated from the Latin), a brief glossary and bibliographical note, and a sensible introduction. Oliver Reverdin's *QUATORZE CALVINISTES CHEZ LES TOPINAMBOUS* (Geneva: Droz. 1957. 110 pp. 8 Sw. fr.) is an account of the mission despatched from Geneva in 1556 to bring Calvinism to the Tupi tribes of Brazil—the only one of its kind attempted by any Protestant church, so far as America was concerned, in the sixteenth century. The relations between Villegagnon and the Calvinists became bad and he refused to let them establish a church in the French colony. They had only two months with the Topinambá tribe and learnt that its conversion, if possible at all, would be a very slow process. However, they did collect some useful ethnological material. Instead of persevering, the majority sailed back to France, three of those who did not being executed by Villegagnon, who treated them worse than did the cannibals. The essay, and the extracts from Jean de Léry which are added to it, make up a scholarly and interesting little book.

*University of Liverpool*

D. B. QUINN

BARBADOS AND THE CONFEDERATION QUESTION 1871-1885. By Bruce Hamilton. London: published by the Crown Agents for Overseas Governments for the Government of Barbados. 1956. xviii + 149 pp. 15s. Much of the nineteenth-century history of the British West Indies still remains to be written, and this applies especially to the period after Emancipation. Philip Curtin's *Two Jamaicas* has helped to fill in some of the outlines for an important island. Dr. Hamilton's book, concerning Barbados chiefly, is another volume which throws light on this subject.

This book is a clearly written and well-documented study of a political crisis of the '70's in Barbados. The background to this crisis was provided by

the vaguely-defined 'Confederation' policy, which, in conjunction with Crown Colony rule, was regarded in the Colonial Office as the solution for post-Emancipation problems of government in the English islands. The crisis arose from the determined opposition to both these aims of a well-entrenched ruling group in Barbados. The crisis was resolved when the Colonial Office reluctantly decided to abandon its 'nostrums', and to adopt instead political changes acceptable to the Barbadian opposition.

Dr. Hamilton gives a detailed survey of events before, during, and after the crisis, and of the many public and private persons involved in these events. The dominating figures were those of Hennessy, Herbert, and Reeves—Hennessy, the Governor, a humanitarian Conservative, suspect for his sympathy towards the 'lower orders'; Herbert, the Colonial Office man, well-meaning but priggish, embodying, all too completely, the merits and defects of his office; and the Barbadian, Reeves, a conservative Whig, who risked all his prospects as a Crown official, to devote himself to the task of 'saving the constitution' by opposing the will of the Colonial Office. The essential issue was that of representative government, as against government by the Crown.

Hamilton exposes the situation with competence. The local government and society were insular and self-complacent, yet both were riddled with abuses. However, the reforming policies of the Colonial Office, well-intentioned as they appear to have been, were quite unrealistic; and its officials too often suffered from a dangerous confidence in their own infallibility. Given a Governor as impetuous and plain-spoken as the unlucky Hennessy, some deepening of the political crises, already in existence when he was appointed, was only to be expected. Hennessy made the crisis even more acute by his disturbing social criticism of Barbados. Given, besides, the virulence, the lack of scruple, the inequities of public life in the island, it is not surprising that the increased tension led to an outbreak of disorder. Once this outbreak had taken place, both the Colonial Office and the Barbadians were frightened, and a compromise became possible. The architect of this compromise was the man of colour, Reeves, who became the single most effective defender of that preponderantly white oligarchy to which he could never quite belong.

The story has its bizarre fascination. It has, too, a wider significance, as a contrast to the fate of Jamaica, both before and after the 'Rebellion' of 1865. It indicates that Crown Colony government was neither the only possible mode of political adjustment to the pressures of a 'free' society, nor the mode most acceptable to substantial sections of public opinion in the British West Indies during the later nineteenth century.

*University College of the West Indies*

ELSA V. GOVEIA

It would be idle to pretend that the books in this batch are an entirely representative sample of current American historical writing. Even so, they do exhibit a number of prevalent trends.

Perhaps it is appropriate to begin with the *EVOLUTION OF HISTORIOGRAPHY IN AMERICA, 1870-1910*, by Amal Tripathi (Calcutta: World Press, 1956. xi + 106 pp. 12s. 6d.). His little book provides an outline of the 'formative period' of historiography in the United States—the period of 'scientific' history that followed upon the great amateurs (Prescott, Motley,

Parkman), and that anticipated the 'relativism' of Charles A. Beard and James Harvey Robinson. There is nothing particularly new in Dr. Tripathi's account, which originated as an M.A. thesis at Columbia University; he may have relied more on certain secondary works than is apparent on the surface; and there are occasional oddities of syntax or typography. Within modest limits, however, he has produced a competent summary.

A more exacting scholarly labour is revealed in Professor Richard L. Morton's edition of *THE PRESENT STATE OF VIRGINIA*, by Hugh Jones (North Carolina University Press. London: O.U.P. 1956. xiv + 295 pp. 40s.). Jones, an Anglican clergyman, professor of natural philosophy and mathematics at William and Mary College, published his survey in 1724, when he had had seven years' experience of life in the New World. A subsequent edition was prepared by Joseph Sabin in 1865. Since this was limited to a mere 200 copies, there was room for Professor Morton's third edition of a work which, though slighter than the account of Virginia left by Thomas Jefferson and less impish than the contemporary writings of William Byrd, is nevertheless a sensible, informative guide. The editor's introduction sets out what is known of Jones's life (he died in Maryland in 1760, a rector in comfortable circumstances); and the notes, which occupy as much space as the text, supply an admirably detailed commentary. There is a good index, and the book is pleasantly produced, with reproductions of title-pages, photographs of Williamsburg, and endpaper maps.

Another laborious editorial task has been performed by Bernhard A. Uhlenдорff, in translating and annotating *REVOLUTION IN AMERICA: CONFIDENTIAL LETTERS AND JOURNALS, 1776-1784, OF ADJUTANT GENERAL MAJOR BAURMEISTER OF THE HESSIAN FORCES* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press. 1957. xv + 640 pp. \$9.00). Baurmeister served on the staff of the commander of the large contingent of troops from Hesse-Cassel. He also acted for a while as A.D.C. to Sir Henry Clinton. Between September 1776, when he had just disembarked on Long Island, and April 1784, when he was at length back in Germany, Baurmeister sent 94 situation reports to the minister of state of Hesse-Cassel. With other documents in the von Jungkenn papers, these now repose in the William L. Clements collection at Ann Arbor. A small proportion dealing with the Philadelphia campaign of 1777 have already been published by Mr. Uhlenдорff, but the majority appear here in print for the first time. Unfortunately they are not of outstanding importance. Baurmeister was a professional soldier, and as far as lay within his scope he transmitted accurate information. Yet though he was at headquarters, it is clear that he was usually excluded from major discussions of policy: his general exercised an administrative rather than a strategic command. And if he knew much of headquarters intrigue it is not retailed in these discreet, deferential communiqués. Now and then he hints obliquely that the British conduct of the war was less than perfect. But he keeps his native pride in check—disappointingly so in the brief, pained references to the Hessian disaster at Trenton. Nor, as he was usually far from the scene of action, is there much first-hand description. However, the book sheds some light on the activities of the German regiments, and upon such problems as desertion, sickness, pay, prisoners and reinforcements. The picture is filled out a little by Erhard Städtler's *DIE ANSBACH-BAYREUTHER TRUPPEN IM AMERIKANISCHEN UNABHÄNGIGKEITSKRIEG*,



1777-1783 (Nuremberg: Kommissionsverlag Die Egge. 1956. 185 pp.). This is a careful analysis, mainly of relevance to genealogists, of the fate of the mercenaries despatched to America by the Markgrave of Ansbach-Bayreuth. Of the 2459 officers and men identified and named by the compiler, 1379 returned safely home in 1783; 401 died in America (nearly all through illness, not in battle); and the remaining 679 either deserted in the United States or settled in Nova Scotia.

At this point we may mention another documentary source, WILLIAM BOLLAERT'S TEXAS (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1956. xxiii + 421 pp. \$5.00). Bollaert was an Englishman whose diaries and journals, though consulted by scholars at the Newberry Library in Chicago, have not hitherto been printed in full. This edition, prepared with exemplary thoroughness by W. Eugene Hollon and Ruth Lapham Butler, makes good the omission. Their effort was worthwhile, for Bollaert proves to have been an intelligent observer. A well-read, restless man, he had already essayed a number of careers when in 1842 he came to Texas, half intending to live there permanently. He roamed about the then-independent republic, enlisting for a spell in its navy, meeting its leaders, recording its climate, flora and fauna as well as attempting to cast its political horoscope. But the rainbow's end eluded him, and he sailed for home from Galveston in 1844. An engaging narrative of a man who, one feels, deserved better luck.

For a work of far wider implications, however, we must turn to CHARLES BEARD AND THE CONSTITUTION (Princeton University Press. London: O.U.P. 1956. 219 pp. 28s.), by Robert E. Brown. This is a study, 'from the standpoint of historical method', of Beard's famous volume *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* (1913). It offers a direct challenge to Beard's argument that, from conception to ratification, the Constitution of 1787 was the brain-child of a 'consolidated group' of influential Americans who knew that they would benefit economically from the adoption of the new system of government; that the Constitution was thus 'essentially an economic document'; and that it was not approved by free vote of the American people at large, mainly because of suffrage restrictions. As Mr. Brown remarks, Beard's notions have gained acceptance among most American historians, though the initial response to them was by no means universally cordial.

But to Mr. Brown, man should not live by Beard alone—or even by Beard at all. To prove as much, he adopts the exact structure of Beard's book and follows the trail of evidence like an indefatigable detective, chapter by chapter, citation by citation. The result is a fascinating and very able indictment. To re-examine Beard's book in the light of this commentary is to be made all too clearly aware of the errors, gaps, muddles and unwarranted conclusions that mar it. There seems little doubt that Beard can never again be regarded as an expert witness on the Founding Fathers. In particular Mr. Brown demolishes the Beardian distinction between 'realty' and 'personalty' holdings; the Beardian contention that the Constitution-makers represented 'personalty' rather than 'realty'; and the Beardian suggestion that the mass of American citizens was 'disfranchised' (he points out that Beard often used the word to describe enfranchised citizens who were too apathetic to vote). Beard, in short, is portrayed as not a scrupulous historian but a radical publicist. In place of Beard's interpretation Mr. Brown offers

the counter-thesis that 'the Constitution was adopted in a society which was fundamentally democratic, . . . and . . . by a people who were primarily middle-class property owners'.

In this book and in his previous study, *Middle-Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts*, Mr. Brown has demonstrated commendable alertness and acuity. Has he, though, entirely annihilated Beard? And is his own thesis an acceptable substitute? In each case one feels that he attacks on too narrow a front. Beard, after all, was himself a revisionist. We may be better off now without his progressive ideas, his stress on economic factors, his hints at conspiracy. But could we have done without them once? To generalize is, perhaps, to exaggerate. Granted that some generalizations are sounder than others, we may still maintain that Beard's was a healthy scepticism that did much to clear away an outmoded view of the Constitution as a hallowed document produced in a void of abstract principle. In this sense, whether he likes it or not, Mr. Brown is Beard's heir. And not only Beard's heir, for Beard drew upon the work of several contemporaries—J. Allen Smith, A. M. Simons, E. R. A. Seligman, J. W. Burgess—who shared his assumptions. Yet, engrossed in his brief, Mr. Brown treats Beard with scholastic severity, as sole culprit. Where, for example, Beard quotes Burgess, Mr. Brown ignores the attribution and treats the statement as though it were a further instance of Beard's unique folly. To regard Beard as the spokesman for his generation is one thing: to make him its scapegoat is, in a broad context, oddly unhistorical as well as uncharitable.

Though he is a more meticulous historian than Beard, one suspects that to a future generation Mr. Brown's own thesis may seem over-argued. If Beard was careless in his employment of such words as *economic*, the same might be said of Mr. Brown's fondness for *middle-class* and *democracy*. Can one, without further definition, apply them to the America of the 1780's? Even if most adult white males *were* enfranchised freeholders, does it follow that class-divisions were insignificant in all the states? Might not a habit of deference have swayed the electorate in casting its votes? If it did not trouble to vote, even when the ratification of the Constitution was at stake, might not its indifference have placed power in the hands of primeval ward-heelers? These and many others are still open questions. It is a tribute to Mr. Brown that he makes us consider them afresh. One trusts that in years to come he and equally sharp-witted colleagues will provide us with some of the answers.

It is a pleasure to turn from polemic to the two learned, lapidary volumes by Professor Samuel Flagg Bemis on the career of America's sixth president: JOHN QUINCY ADAMS AND THE FOUNDATIONS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1949, reprinted 1956. xix + 588 + xv pp. \$7.50), and JOHN QUINCY ADAMS AND THE UNION (Knopf. 1956. xv + 547 pp. \$8.75). In the first, Adams is seen as diplomatist and 'continentalist': as American minister and negotiator in Europe, as U.S. senator, and finally as Monroe's secretary of state. The second volume takes up the story, with a little overlapping, from the eve of Adams's election to the presidency in 1824 to his death in 1848.

Vol. I, on its appearance some years ago, was at once recognized to be an indispensable work, by one who had already made several distinguished contributions to American diplomatic history. Making use of the newly

available Adams papers, and displaying a scholar's familiarity with a host of other materials, it offered a masterly restatement—in biographical terms—of the early formulations of American foreign policy. Since Adams was intimately concerned with all of these, his career provided an excellent framework.

One wondered whether it would be possible to score a comparable success with the second volume. For one thing, the author was moving somewhat away from his chosen field. For another, Adams poses serious problems for the biographer. He is not a congenial figure; and his period as President was a failure—at least in popular estimation. With a single exception his predecessors had all won re-election for a further four years: Adams, like his father, the second president, was elbowed out unceremoniously after only one term. He returned to public life, but as a mere member of the House of Representatives. In this capacity he alienated many former supporters by appearing to contradict himself. The 'continentalist' opposed the annexation of Texas; and yet abolitionists were almost as annoyed by his reasoning as were the annexationists. How then is the biographer to avoid tedious anti-climax? Professor Bemis triumphs over his difficulties. He deeply admires his irascible hero, though not concealing Adams's faults. He manages to communicate to the reader his own appreciation of Adams's integrity and tenacity. In the process, something of the fire of 'Old Man Eloquence' has passed to Professor Bemis. Some of his previous books had every virtue except ease of style. Now, however, as he recounts Adams's eight-year struggle in the House over the 'gag rule', or the magnificent defence of the negro slaves in the *Amistad* case before the Supreme Court, awkwardness disappears. True, he has been able to paraphrase Adams's own account, from the *Memoirs*. But he has done so with such skill and authority that the result is a biography of the highest quality, by a scholar who seems to have found his ideal subject. Each volume is embellished with several portraits, and there are seven useful maps to illustrate the course of American diplomacy.

Finally, two books—very different in emphasis—on the Civil War whose approach Adams foresaw. *SHERMAN'S MARCH THROUGH THE CAROLINAS* (North Carolina University Press. O.U.P. 1956. x + 325 pp. 48s.), by John G. Garrett, examines the exploits of Sherman and his troops in the three-month period between his departure from Savannah in January 1865 and his armistice negotiations with General Joseph E. Johnston. In this period he advanced several hundred miles, leaving a trail of destruction forty miles wide. The larger elements in the story are sometimes obscured by the intricate detail of Mr. Garrett's narrative. However, he is a very fair historian (which still cannot be said of all American students of their Civil War), and a number of interesting points emerge from the evidence he presents. The burning of Columbia, South Carolina, and innumerable other, less spectacular catastrophes indicate that discipline was far too lax among the Union soldiers. Sherman's indecisive handling of the battle at Bentonville lends colour to the belief that he was primarily a strategist, not a tactical genius.

The Union's military effort as a whole is described by Bruce Catton in *THIS HALLOWED GROUND* (London: Gollancz. 437 pp. 16s.). He does not deal with the political scene, except in passing, nor with diplomacy, nor



with naval actions. His concern is with soldiery, and battles. Mr. Catton is thoroughly at home with such material—he has produced several books on the Civil War—and handles it with brisk efficiency. His wider speculations are thin in content, underneath their coating of rhetoric. But his book can be recommended to those who wish to know more of the emotions and experiences of the average Union soldier. A folksy record, but in the main lucid and well-informed.

*University of Manchester*

MARCUS CUNLIFFE

## ASIA

THE INDIAN CHRISTIANS OF ST. THOMAS. By L. W. Brown. Cambridge University Press. 1956. xii + 315 pp. 40s.

The so-called 'Syrian' church of Malabar was traditionally founded by the apostle Thomas. It seems in fact to owe its origin to Nestorian missionaries, following in the wake of Iranian merchants in the days before the coming of Islam to Persia. The Christians of Malabar, despite their remoteness from the great centres of the faith, have kept their religion alive in fundamental purity for well over a millennium, and though in matters of social custom they have compromised with the Hindu culture around them, adopting caste practices and many other Hindu ways, they have never been influenced by the Hindu doctrine of transmigration, and appear to have retained the Nestorian aversion to idolatry. During the time of Portuguese influence the Synod of Diamper, held in 1599, initiated a period of union with Rome, which came to an end in 1653, when many of the Christians of St. Thomas threw off their allegiance to the Pope at a great meeting, famous in local history, at the Cross of Maṭṭaṅcēri (Coonen), and placed themselves under the spiritual authority of the Patriarch of Antioch. After this the Church was more than once torn by schisms, which survive to the present day, but it has continued to flourish, its members prospering thanks to their important part in the spice trade. In recent years the Syrian Christians have become one of the best educated communities in South India, and have suffered less from the counter-propaganda of a resurgent Hinduism than have most of the more recently founded Christian communities of India, though it is said that Syrian Christians have turned to Communism in proportionately larger numbers than the Hindus of Malabar, and that the recently elected Communist government of Kerala State gained many Christian votes.

Many writers on church history have taken note of this ancient outpost of Christianity, but there are few reliable monographs upon it, and these are out of date in some particulars and inadequate in others. The present work is both up-to-date and thorough. Its author, now Bishop of Uganda, was formerly principal of a theological seminary at Trivandrum, and has the advantages of a deep knowledge of Malayālam and close friendships with many leaders of the Syrians, both clerical and lay. He gives a really comprehensive account of the Church of St. Thomas, both in the past and at the present day, and handles his theme with a scholarly fairness which distinguishes his book from most of those previously written on the subject. In dealing with the legends of St. Thomas he is free from the credulity to which many earlier writers on the subject have been prone. Unlike some earlier

Protestant authorities, he treats the rather unhappy story of relations between the Malabar Christians and the Holy See quite fairly, without trying to draw anti-Catholic morals from it. He displays no indignation or distress at the fact that in their daily lives the St. Thomas Christians have accepted much that is Hindu. This study is, in fact, the work of a Christian of the modern type, whose convictions are strong enough to allow him to write without prejudice. It will long be the standard textbook on the subject, both for the Indologist and the student of church history. A few minor errors do not appreciably lessen its value, and it would be invidious to mention them here.

*School of Oriental and African Studies, London*

A. L. BASHAM

THE DOUBLE PATRIOTS: A STUDY OF JAPANESE NATIONALISM. By Richard Storry. London: Chatto and Windus. 1957. 335 pp. 25s.

After a rapid rise to the rank of a Great Power, the Japanese Empire met its doom in 1945. For national bankruptcy the ultra-nationalists were undoubtedly responsible. Yet, in contrast with their European counterparts, the Nazis and the Fascists, the Japanese nationalists never organized a national movement. Even the Military Tribunal for the Far East failed to prove the existence of 'a single grand conspiracy'. The question then is, how did the nationalists seize power? How did they become involved in an adventure fatal to themselves as well as to the whole nation?

Mr. Storry presents a study of their ideas and activities in the years 1931-41. His success is partly due to his skilful use of the most reliable source materials, especially the Transcripts and Exhibits of I.M.T.F.E. and the memoirs by Prince Saionji; but also to his ability to weave his material into a well-balanced and readable account. Mr. Storry is familiar with the best Japanese scholarship in the subject and shows a keen insight into Japanese politics.

Although the ultra-nationalist groups were not strong before 1920 and had little chance of gaining power before 1931, the factor which gave them their chance was latent in the official ideology of modern Japan; and because of this a narrow and disunited leadership found it difficult, both psychologically and physically, to resist them. After 1931 this leadership was undermined and disintegrated by the rise to power of the Army, with which civilian extremists co-operated not only in setting up military rule in Manchuria but also in trying to extend this rule to Japan itself. This effort failed; but fascism 'from below' could be met only by fascism 'from above'. This led in turn to the disastrous alliance with the Axis and to national suicide. All this was the result not of a grand conspiracy but rather of the confused dilemma with which Japanese leadership was faced.

Paradoxically, the Emperor, the very core of nationalist belief, is shown to have been disgusted with the fanatical nationalists. Nevertheless, I believe that it was the narrowness, even more than the disunity, of government in Japan which explains its incompetence. It is to be hoped that the author will add to this valuable study one relating developments in Japan in fuller detail to the changing international situation.

*University of Tokyo*

KAN'ICHI FUKUDA

## GENERAL

AN HISTORIAN'S APPROACH TO RELIGION. By Arnold Toynbee. Oxford University Press. 1956. 316 pp. 21s.

THE SIEGE PERILOUS. ESSAYS IN BIBLICAL ANTHROPOLOGY. By S. H. Hooke. London: S.C.M. Press. 1956. 264 pp. 21s.

It would be difficult to find two more contrasting approaches to the study of religion than represented by these two distinguished scholars. With Professor Hooke the reader always has his feet firmly on the ground of text and ascertained fact derived from a detailed study of the history and ritual of the ancient New East. The answer to his final question 'What is Christianity?' is given on this basis. Professor Toynbee's Gifford Lectures of 1952 and 1953 take in the whole scope of man's religious experience seen against the background of all human history. It is indeed a pity that the author tends to obscure his important and essentially simple message by an involved and difficult style. He maintains at the outset, that underlying the apparent infinite variety of human religions, Man's worship or quest is resolved into three objectives, 'namely Nature; Man himself; and an Absolute Reality that is not either Nature or Man, but is in them and at the same time beyond them'. Man's attempts to free himself from the thralldom of natural self-centredness and appreciate realities beyond himself, whether in the worship of nature, the community, or God, is the basis of his religious history. The first lectures are devoted to a profound historical analysis of the combinations and conflicts in the Ancient World caused by these differing quests for Reality. Though the specialist may pick out the occasional error in detail when the author encroaches on his own field, he cannot deny the boldness and sweep of the general picture. Throughout, the lectures combine great scope and learning with the mastery of the results of most recent research. The chapters dealing with the conflict between Rome, representing the worship of Community, with Christianity in the first three centuries are stimulating indeed.

In the second part, Toynbee places the problem of religion today in the perspective of the Western technological revolution of the last three hundred years. He points to the discredit into which theology fell after the Thirty Years War and its replacement in the scale of human values by the study of the natural sciences. He outlines the subsequent advance of Western man to a dominant rôle in the world. If one feels that the author has placed excessive reliance on Bayle as the prophet of the new era, there is no doubt that his analysis is justified. Not until the onset of the Atomic Age in 1945 was the supremacy of the technologist as guide and liberator of humanity to be challenged. The new science entails, however, an ever growing restriction on human liberty and security, and Toynbee argues that as a consequence, 'the spiritual field of activity, not the physical one, is going to be the domain of freedom'. Suffering as well as curiosity will drive men to grapple with the mystery of the Universe.

What kind of spiritual activity will this be? Toynbee makes an impressive plea for a relativist view of religion. After 6000 or so years of civilized forms of life and thought, seven higher religions survive with œcumenical claims. These are the carriers of 'the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world'. The annihilation of distance, however, will lead to their



mutual interpenetration, and though it is unlikely that any one religion will dominate the world, religious allegiances will tend less to follow geographic boundaries. The author's sympathies appear to lie between Mahāyāna Buddhism and a Christianity purged of both Pharisaism and of accretions due to the particular form in which it was presented to intellectuals in the Ancient World. But fundamentally, 'the heart of so great mystery cannot ever be reached by following one road only'. The author's quotation from Symmachus (*Relatio 3*) comes significantly at the end of his long survey.

This approach to religion has much to commend it. The history of the Christian schismatic movements of the fourth to seventh centuries, followed by the permanent advance of Islam into the traditional homelands of the Christian faith, suggest that humanly speaking the relativist view is justified by events. The development which Toynbee, however, does not appear to foresee is that under the impact of a materialist approach to knowledge, large sections of mankind may revert from the quest of Reality in higher religions to an idolization of the Community or Nature. When shortly before his dismissal from the Premiership of Jordan in April 1957, Suleiman Nabulsi defined the religion of his country as 'Arab nationalism', rather than Islam, he may have been stating a truth of wider application than he realized. The problem, too, of communicating Christianity in an ever-modern idiom remains intractable. The history of the Church is littered with the debris of modernist movements, from the failure of the Jesuit Far Eastern missions in the seventeenth century to the personal tragedies of Loisy and Tyrrell. Today, it is the appeal of Nature Worship supported by an authoritative ecclesiastical dogmatism that retains for Christianity much of its hold in the West. Toynbee also, by laying his emphasis exclusively on Original Sin and Suffering as the hall-marks of higher religion, appears to neglect the essential optimism of the Christian message and its life-giving and liberating truths. The historian's approach to religion must take both into account.

*The Siege Perilous* leads us back to a more historical understanding of religion, though Professor Hooke's *Credo* is as timeless as Toynbee's. He relates how in 1930 he told the late Bishop Gore at his Selection Board interview for the post of Samuel Davidson Professor of Old Testament Studies in the University of London, that he wished to 'try and build a bridge between the three disciplines of Anthropology, Archaeology and Biblical Studies'. He has succeeded admirably, and part of the proof is contained in this collection of essays written over the last twenty-five years. Here, one can study something of the primitive sub-stratum of beliefs prevalent in the Near East 5000-7000 years ago from which Judaism and finally Christianity emerged. We see the Israelites' king as the sacred representative of his people's God, who was Himself conceived in terms of the local *baal*, as the lord of the land and source of fertility. Christian apocalyptic is related to the forms and symbols of a ritual pattern traditional in the Near East. Such links form the framework from which early Christianity cannot be divorced. Hooke does not cloud the issue with far-flung comparisons with religions in other parts of the globe. He rightly confines his enquiry to the Semitic Near East. One only regrets that the bulk of these essays preceded the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. As it is, the author's contribution to the origins of both Old and New Testament religion is a distinguished one.

*Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge*

W. H. C. FRENCH

## OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

- K. L. Latourette: *THE HISTORY OF JAPAN* (Revised edition, first published as *The Development of Japan*, 1918). New York: The Macmillan Company. 1957. Illus. 299 pp. 35s.
- BRYCHEINIOG. Transactions of the Brecknock Society, edited by D. J. Davies. The Museum, Glamorgan Street, Brecon. 15s.
- O. Fijo: *SOME DATA ON NAUTICAL EDUCATION ON THE YUGOSLAV COAST IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenske akademije. 93 pp.
- Hilda Lewis: I, JACQUELINE. London: Jarrolds. 1957. 352 pp. 15s.
- Karl Löwith: *MEANING IN HISTORY*. University of Chicago Press: Cambridge University Press. First published 1949 Reissue 1957. 257 pp. 12s. 6d.
- M. A. Thomson: *SOME DEVELOPMENTS IN ENGLISH HISTORIOGRAPHY DURING THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY*. An inaugural lecture. London: H. K. Lewis for University College, London. 1957. 24 pp. 2s. 6d.
- W. G. Hiscock: *JOHN EVELYN AND HIS FAMILY CIRCLE*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1955. 256 pp. 25s.
- G. Lepointe: *HISTOIRE DU DROIT PUBLIC FRANÇAIS*. Paris: Presses Universitaires ('Que sais-je?'). 1957. 128 pp.
- Victor Larock: ERASME, 'ELOGE DE LA FOLIE', TEXTES TRADUITS ET ANNOTÉS. Brussels: Office de Publicité, S.A. 1957. 90 pp. 65 fr. belg.
- Paul Weber: *HISTOIRE DU GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG*. Brussels: Office de Publicité, S.A. 1957. 120 pp. 75 fr. belg.
- YORKSHIRE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY, Part 134. 1957. 221 pp.
- Jean Richard: *HISTOIRE DE LA BOURGOGNE*. Paris: Presses Universitaires. 1957. 128 pp.
- V. T. H. Delany: *THE FREDERIC WILLIAM MAITLAND READER*. New York: Oceana Publications. 1957. 254 pp. \$1.00 paper, \$3.50 cloth.
- Andrew Boyd: *AN ATLAS OF WORLD AFFAIRS*. London: Methuen. 1957. Maps. 159 pp. 15s.
- W. Lloyd Williams: *HISTORY TRAILS IN MELBOURNE*. Sydney and London: Angus and Robertson. 1957. Illus. 110 pp. 12s. 6d.
- Dagobert D. Runes: *A BOOK OF CONTEMPLATION*. New York: Philosophical Library. 1957. 149 pp. \$3.
- P. M. Joshi (ed.): *SELECTIONS FROM THE PESHWA DAFTOR*. New Series I. *EXPANSION OF MARATHA POWER (1707-1761)*. Bombay: Government Central Press. 1957. Rs. 1.86.
- G. S. Sardesai: *HISTORICAL GENEALOGIES*. Bombay: Government Central Office. 1957. Rs. 1.58.
- H. College: *ANTOINE WIERTZ*. Brussels: La Renaissance du livre. 1957. 155 pp.
- J. G. Edwards: *THE NORMANS AND THE WELSH MARCH* (The Raleigh Lecture, 1956). London: Oxford University Press. 1957. 25 pp. 3s. 6d.
- O. H. van der Gablentz: *DIE POLITISCHEN THEORIEN SEIT DER FRANZÖSISCHEN REVOLUTION: POLITISCHE THEORIEN TIEL III*. Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag. 1957. 247 pp. DM. 8.80.
- C. V. Wedgwood: *THE SENSE OF THE PAST* (The Leslie Stephen Lecture, 1957). Cambridge University Press. 1957. 27 pp. 3s. 6d.
- Gustav Schnürer: *CHURCH AND CULTURE IN THE MIDDLE AGES*, vol. I, 350-814, translated by G. I. Undreiner. New Jersey: St. Antony Guild Press. 1956. 514 pp. \$7.50.
- Hugh Ross Williamson: *THE BEGINNING OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION*. London: Sheed and Ward. 1957. 96 pp. 3s. 6d.
- N. L. F. Chirovsky: *THE ECONOMIC FACTORS IN THE GROWTH OF RUSSIA*. New York: Philosophical Library. 1957. xv + 178 pp. \$3.75.
- Mabel B. Casner and Ralph H. Gabriel: *THE STORY OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY*. 3rd edition. 1957. 720 pp. Illus. Maps.
- T. V. Smith and Marjorie Grene (ed.): *PHILOSOPHERS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES: FROM DESCARTES TO LOCKE*. University of Chicago Press: Cambridge University Press. 1957. 482 pp. 15s.

# Museum Bookshelves

EDITOR: CATHERINE B. FIRTH

## A NEW SERIES OF SMALL 32-PAGE MUSEUM GUIDE BOOKS PUBLISHED BY GINN

\* FIRST SHELF

ANCIENT CIVILIZATIONS

6s. 0d. the set

1. *Men of the Stone Age*, by A. F. Titterton
2. *The Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age*, by A. F. Titterton
3. *Everyday Life in Sumer and Babylonia*, by K. M. Gadd
4. *Work and Play in Ancient Egypt*, by K. M. Gadd
5. *The Warfare and Hunting of Assyrian Kings*, by K. M. Gadd
6. *The Artists of Greece*, by K. M. Gadd

Teachers' Booklet by authors and editor 16 pages 6d.

THE six booklets in the First Shelf of *Museum Bookshelves* have been written with the ages 11 to 13 in mind, though they are capable of use in different ways by older and even by younger boys and girls.

*Museum Bookshelves*, like the *History Bookshelves*, help children to find answers to their own questions. The booklets which deal with the Stone, Bronze and Early Iron Ages are of special value for museum visits. Exhibits are widely dispersed in small local collections, and stone implements may be handled by boys and girls. On the other hand the treasures of Sumer, Egypt, Assyria and Greece must, generally speaking, be sought in London. This difficulty is recognized in the text, and met, as far as possible, by the abundance of illustrations. Teachers will find practical suggestions in the booklets prepared for their use.

The Second and Third Shelves deal respectively with 'raw materials' and 'finished products'.

### In preparation

#### SECOND SHELF

*Middle Centuries*, 600-1600 A.D.  
Everyday Metals      Stone  
Gold, Silver and      Threads  
Precious Stones      Wood  
Skins

Teachers' Booklet

#### THIRD SHELF

*Modern Centuries*, 1600-1940 A.D.  
Dress      Houses  
Furniture      Pictures  
Gardens and      Household  
Parks      Treasures

Teachers' Booklet

## SEND FOR LOAN COPIES

To: GINN AND COMPANY LTD., 18 Bedford Row, London, W.C.1.

Please send details of *Museum Bookshelves* and a loan copy of *First Shelf: Ancient Civilizations*.

Name .....

School .....

H.81



---

# ANGEVIN GOVERNMENT<sup>1</sup>

---

H. M. COLVIN

*St. John's College, Oxford*

IT IS OVER TWENTY YEARS since Professor Butterfield felt impelled to expose what he called the 'Whig interpretation' of history, by which he meant the tendency of English historians to study the past with minds biassed by the preconceptions of nineteenth-century liberalism. Professor Butterfield's strictures were directed chiefly against the historians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the remoteness of medieval studies from present-day problems has generally been supposed to protect them from such unscholarly tendencies. There are, nevertheless, at least two cognate heresies to which medievalists have been prone. One is the traditional conception of a free peasant society gradually reduced to servitude by feudal pressure which has recently been under attack from more than one quarter. The other is an unconscious tendency to look at the medieval past from a monarchical point of view; to seek everywhere for signs of incipient royal power in just the same way as the Whig historians sought everywhere for signs of embryonic parliamentary authority: in short to concentrate attention on royal institutions rather than on feudal ones, to applaud kings as lions of justice, but to deplore barons as beasts of prey. And yet kings were not always just, nor barons invariably irresponsible. It was in the reign of Henry II, not in the anarchy of his predecessor, that a Buckinghamshire lord, when asked to confirm a gift to a religious house, declared himself ready to warrant it against all men 'except in case of royal violence' (*præter regiam uiolentiam*);<sup>2</sup> in the thirteenth century it was the barons who, as Professor Powicke and Miss Cam have showed us, joined with the monarchy in the 'joint enterprise' of governing medieval England, and in the fourteenth and fifteenth it was as much want of governance as unwillingness to be governed which led to the tragedy of the Wars of the Roses.

<sup>1</sup> J. Boussard, *Le Gouvernement d'Henri II Plantagenet*. Paris: Librairie d'Argences. 1956. lxxviii + 689 pp. About 70s.

*Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, vol. ii *Regesta Henrici Primi 1100-1135*, ed. C. Johnson and H. A. Cronne from the collections of the late H. W. C. Davis. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1956. 454 pp. £5 5s.

<sup>2</sup> *Early Buckinghamshire Charters*, ed. Fowler and Jenkins (Bucks. Arch. Soc. Records Branch, 1939), p. 3.

It is, one suspects, partly because of this royalist interpretation of medieval history that a full-scale history of the Angevin Empire has been so long delayed. 'Des deux côtés de la Manche', writes M. Boussard, 'les historiens, coupés les uns des autres par une séparation qui remonte à la scission de l'empire Plantagenêt en 1204, ont été surtout préoccupés par l'aspect national des problèmes. . . . Par une simplification regrettable et génératrice d'anachronismes, on a fait de la rivalité des Plantagenêts et des Capétiens une "première Guerre de Cent ans" qui a rejeté Henri II et ses fils dans le camp des souverains étrangers, adversaires de la dynastie nationale, et on a mis la personne et l'œuvre de ce prince en-dehors des préoccupations historiques de notre pays; son histoire n'est mentionnée que dans la mesure où elle est mêlée à l'expansion des Capétiens et à leurs luttes, de même qu'en Angleterre, la partie continentale de son empire passe pour une sorte de dominion dont l'importance n'est qu'accessoire.' But, as he rightly insists, the history of Henry II's empire deserves to be studied for its own sake as that of a state neither French nor English, but built up of feudal relationships which recognized neither racial nor territorial limitations. To define those relationships was, therefore, M. Boussard's first task as the historian of the Angevin Empire, and it is with a survey of those fiefs which recognized Henry II as their lord that his book begins. It occupies over 150 pages of text, and in the course of it M. Boussard identifies and describes all the principal fiefs from the Cheviots to the Pyrenees. This alone is no small achievement, and as a kind of directory of Angevin vassals it will long remain an invaluable work of reference for scholars on both sides of the Channel. As an accompaniment to this part of his text M. Boussard has provided a set of maps which will, however, be somewhat of a disappointment to English readers. Indifferently drawn to various scales (what the actual scales may be is not stated) they serve to illustrate nothing so much as a recent observation of Professor Le Patourel that 'the tradition of French historians in the matter of illustrative maps seems unworthy of their scholarship',<sup>3</sup> and the manifold inaccuracies of those which profess to show the castles of Angevin England do not inspire confidence in the maps of Henry's continental dominions. To enumerate these inaccuracies would be tedious, but anyone who chooses to compare *cartes* 3-6 with the accompanying map<sup>4</sup> will be able to draw his own conclusions.

It is not, however, by its maps alone that M. Boussard's book deserves to be judged, and the 589 pages of text contain much matter of the greatest interest to students of twelfth-century institutions both French and English. They are not easy reading, for here are none of the exhilarating notions of Mr. Jolliffe's recent book on *Angevin Kingship*; only the

<sup>3</sup> *English Historical Review*, lxxii (1957), p. 492.

<sup>4</sup> Drawn by Mr. W. Mackie from information assembled by Mr. R. A. Brown and the writer.



### ROYAL CASTLES IN ENGLAND AND WALES 1154-1160

This map does not include castles temporarily in royal custody owing to the minority of tenants-in-chief. Two of the castles shown as royal in 1154 (Knaresborough and Stamford) had passed out of royal control by 1160.



systematic presentation of carefully documented fact. Here the range of M. Boussard's research cannot fail to command respect. In his list of sources he cites no less than 80 French and 64 English cartularies, besides many other documents in the Public Record Office, the British Museum, the Bibliothèque Nationale and the various Archives Départementales of France. He is as familiar with, say, the Publications of the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society as he is with the *Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie*, and there will be few English scholars who will not profit by a perusal of his bibliography. It is clear, in short, that M. Boussard has equipped himself for his task in accordance with the best traditions of French historical scholarship, and that his conclusions are the conclusions of a man who knows the records of Angevin government better probably than anyone since Leopold Delisle. But in Delisle's time much remained in manuscript that is now available in print. The last Pipe Roll of Henry II was not published until 1925, and to have attempted the history of Angevin government before that date would hardly have been possible. Delisle's *Recueil des actes de Henri II* remains, nevertheless, the only existing collection of his charters, and the lack of any comparable work for his English kingdom is an unfortunate *lacuna* in M. Boussard's equipment for which English scholars must take the blame.

Scarcely less unfortunate is the fact that the collection of Henry I's charters edited by Mr. Charles Johnson and Professor Cronne was published too late to figure in his bibliography. For M. Boussard rightly emphasizes the importance of the first Henry's work in laying the foundations for his grandson's government. Henry II, as he points out, was no innovator, and it is well known that in England and in Normandy the reign of Henry I was the norm to which Henry II again and again looked back. To a reviewer M. Boussard's views on the second volume of the *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum* would, moreover, have been interesting in themselves. As a continental scholar he would no doubt have been quick to regret the substitution of English summaries for a full publication of the Latin texts; indeed, the editors themselves regard their work as no more than 'a step towards a more perfect presentation of the acts of the Norman period, in which the full texts can be printed, and original charters reproduced in facsimile'. Meanwhile, as a working repertory of Henry I's charters, their volume will take its place as a twelfth-century forerunner to the Calendars of Chancery Rolls published by the Stationery Office. As such, it constitutes an historical source of the first importance, and a learned introduction and a careful index of persons and places help the historian to find his way among the two thousand texts which Mr. Johnson and Professor Cronne have assembled. The lack of an *index rerum* is, however, a deficiency which will not easily be excused by anyone who is familiar with the 'Index of Subjects' at the end of the Stationery Office Calendars. 'Scutage', we are told by M. Boussard, is a word which

occurs 'even in documents of Henry I'. So it does, but it is without editorial assistance that we eventually run it to earth in nos. 510 and 1499. Other important charters are indeed, mentioned in the introduction, but in such a way that they may easily be overlooked. A remarkable instance of the royal control of subinfeudation in the palatinate of Durham is, for instance, referred to incidentally in the section on 'Justiciars', while attention is drawn to an apparent early reference to the Pipe Rolls only under 'Other Matters'. All this makes it hard work to extract historical gold from the ore which Mr. Johnson and Professor Cronne have spread before us. It is, nevertheless, to this volume that future historians of the twelfth century will have to refer again and again, and whatever its defects may be, they are slight in comparison with its achievement.

Much the same may be said of M. Boussard's *magnum opus*, but for a different reason. It is not the work of a man with an historical message to deliver, but of one who has taken the records of Angevin government as he found them and tried to understand how it worked. And the conclusion he has reached is that the only common factor was Henry II himself. 'Like all the rulers of the Middle Ages from the Carolingians onwards, he built only for himself, and it never occurred to him to establish an immense state with the intention of transmitting it intact to his descendants.' The idea of 'Angevin kingship' on an imperial scale therefore proves to be largely illusory: what M. Boussard has done is to describe for us the complex of feudal (and in England, pre-feudal) rights which for thirty-five years happened to be in the hands of one capable and determined man, and how he manipulated them to his own advantage. Only a Luchaire, perhaps, could have made the story as exciting as M. Boussard has made it scholarly. But there is much that is readable as well as learned in these pages, and no one who is interested in twelfth-century history, English or European, can afford to leave them uncut.

---

# THE IRISH UNIVERSITY QUESTION OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

---

T. W. MOODY

*Trinity College, Dublin*

THE PERIOD OF THIS SURVEY<sup>1</sup> can be defined with precision. The starting-point is 1793, when the University of Dublin, or Trinity College, then the only university in Ireland, was enabled by an act of the Irish parliament to admit, and to confer degrees upon, students, without religious tests. The terminal point is 1908, when an act of the United Kingdom parliament established two new universities, the National University of Ireland and the Queen's University of Belfast, alongside the University of Dublin.

Before 1793 the University of Dublin, like Oxford and Cambridge, was closed to all but anglicans, and from its foundation in 1591 had been identified with English rule and the governing class in Ireland. An Irish university question already existed before 1793 in the demand of catholics and presbyterians for university education; and from 1793 to 1908, though the question assumed new forms and acquired new complexities, it remained rooted in the dissatisfaction of catholics and presbyterians with the provision for university education that the state offered them. It was a question in which problems not only of education but also of religion, politics and economics were involved; and it was a source of intermittent disturbance in Irish public life and in Anglo-Irish relations throughout the nineteenth century.

In the 1780s public discussion in the Irish parliament and the press marked out three possible ways—not mutually exclusive—of dealing with the university problem—(1) Trinity College might be 'opened' by the abolition of religious tests; (2) a new college or colleges might be created within the University of Dublin; (3) new university institutions independent of the existing university might be founded. Liberal opinion in the eighteenth century favoured the first and second solutions. Conservative catholic opinion, and especially that of the clergy, favoured the second and third solutions, while the third was the most generally acceptable to presbyterians. Trinity College itself was ready to accept

<sup>1</sup> Originally delivered as a paper to the Anglo-American Conference of Historians on 12 July 1957. A full bibliography of the subject is included in the bibliography to *Queen's, Belfast, 1845-1949: the history of a university*, by T. W. Moody and J. C. Beckett (to be published in 1958).



the first solution but was absolutely opposed to the second, though the idea of adding a college or colleges to the University of Dublin had a long history. The college was described in its first charter (1592) as 'mater universitatis', and it seems certain that Trinity was intended as the nucleus of a university, which, like the ancient universities of England, would have constituent colleges. During the commonwealth, a scheme for a new college was worked out; and the restoration act of settlement (1662) authorized the Irish government to erect 'another college, to be of the University of Dublin, to be called . . . King's College'. But nothing had come of this, and clearly no new college could be founded within the University of Dublin without a very large alteration in the constitutional position of Trinity College.

There were four parties involved in the question: the government of Ireland, the Church of Ireland or the protestant episcopalians, the protestant dissenters, and the catholics.

1. The government of Ireland was itself part of the British government and in that sense was responsible to the British parliament, where, from 1801, through the union of Ireland with Great Britain, Ireland had its representatives. The rise of parliamentary democracy in the United Kingdom meant that the Irish policy of the government had increasingly to take account of public opinion in both Ireland and Great Britain; while the growth of nationalism in Ireland and the advent of a militant home-rule party in the house of commons intensified the pressure that Irish interests could exert upon, and the embarrassments they could create for, the government. Till 1886 both British parties, and from 1886 the conservatives, intermittently entertained the hope of killing nationalism by kindness; and the adoption of home rule by the liberals in 1886 ensured that from this party nationalist Ireland could expect more than kindness. These conditions compelled British statesmen repeatedly to take up the university question, and in doing so to seek to placate the catholic majority in Ireland without dangerously antagonizing the protestant minority, supported, as it was likely to be, by the overwhelming protestantism of Great Britain.

2. The Church of Ireland was till 1869 the church established by law, and therefore the church of the governing class; and though disestablishment, in 1869, put it on a footing of legal equality with all other churches in Ireland, it continued to be identified with the landed aristocracy and the professions and to occupy throughout the nineteenth century a dominant position in society and the state. Irish churchmen regarded Trinity College as their peculiar sphere; and though a section of them might be willing, and even anxious, to enable other denominations to share in its advantages, they were in general determined to maintain its traditional anglican character and the exclusive connection between Trinity College and the University of Dublin. This attitude came to be modified, without being fundamentally changed, by the conversion of

many churchmen, especially after 1869, to the non-sectarian principle in university education.

3. The protestant dissenters were mainly and most distinctively presbyterians, a middle-class element of tenant farmers, industrialists, businessmen and shopkeepers, located almost entirely in Ulster and preserving close cultural connections with Scotland. In the late-eighteenth century a radical section of Ulster presbyterians took the lead, in alliance with middle-class catholics, in a movement for national independence. But this United Irish movement reached a disastrous and disillusioning climax in the rebellion of 1798, which led directly to the extinction of the Irish parliament and the union of Ireland with Great Britain in 1801. Ulster presbyterians as a body renounced nationalism and became the strongest supporters of the union, but inherited a vigorous tradition of liberal and radical thinking on social questions. This was reflected in a tradition of non-sectarian education cherished by an influential minority of presbyterians. On the other hand the majority of presbyterians differed little from anglicans and catholics in their denominational attitude to education, till the successful working of the non-sectarian system on university level at Belfast after 1849 won them over to its support.

4. Churchmen and protestant nonconformists accounted for about one-quarter of the whole population of Ireland in the late eighteenth century. The remaining three-quarters were catholics, who, under the leadership of liberal protestants, were beginning to emerge from seventy-five years of political, economic and social subjugation. The movement of emancipation reached a critical point in 1793, when the parliamentary franchise was given to catholics on equal terms with protestants. But there the movement halted, and it was not till 1829 that it was brought to fulfilment by a tidal wave of popular agitation led by Daniel O'Connell. The catholics thus gained a consciousness of their collective strength that fundamentally changed the political situation. They demanded, and gradually obtained, reforms designed to give them social equality with protestants; and they adopted home rule as their political creed in the seventies, when the growth of parliamentary democracy was making them unquestionably the strongest force in Irish politics. On the university question, the catholic attitude was largely determined by the clergy. The catholic church in Ireland had by 1793 entered on an era of restoration and revival, in which its whole physical and administrative fabric was rebuilt. It became openly, what it had been covertly, the greatest social institution of catholic Ireland; and its clergy stood out as the most honoured and influential element in catholic society, a force to be reckoned with by the state on all great public questions. During the first half of the period of their survey the catholic prelates tended to be conciliatory and accommodating in their dealings with the state over the university question, but during the second half a much more militant and inflexible spirit characterized

their policy. Throughout the period the catholic laity and clergy usually acted together, but from time to time a section of the catholic laity took a line of their own on the question.

The history of the university question may be grouped around the four most critical stages through which it passed—1793-5, 1845-50, 1873-82, 1901-8.

### *1793-5*

The particular problem that spurred the government into action in these years was that of the higher education of the catholic clergy. Hitherto they had, perforce, obtained their education in Irish colleges on the continent. The French revolution involved the closing down of these colleges in France and Flanders and caused the Irish bishops to regard the continued resort of Irish students to the continent with great apprehension. Anxious to insulate them from the contagion of revolutionary ideas by having them educated on safe conservative principles at home, the bishops looked to the government for help. The government, at war with revolutionary France, and no less eager than the bishops to check the spread of revolutionary influence in Ireland, made large concessions.

A section of the catholic relief act of 1793 and letters patent granted to Trinity College in 1794 enabled catholics (and by implication protestant nonconformists) legally to enter and to graduate in the college. The fellowships, professorships, scholarships and prizes of the college continued to be confined to anglicans, and this severely limited the value of the concession. But the prospect of further concession was held out by a provision in the act of 1793 that, in any future college to be founded in the university, all offices and prizes should be free from religious disqualifications. Despite its limitations, the 'opening' of Trinity College in 1793-4 proved a boon to middle-class catholics, who, without discouragement from their clergy, entered the college in small but significant numbers. Nearly all the catholics who rose to eminence during the first half of the nineteenth century were educated at Trinity College.

The catholic bishops hastened to point out that, however valuable this 'opening' of Trinity College might be for catholic laymen, it could not meet the educational needs of the clergy, for whom a special seminary was essential. The government responded by authorizing in 1795 the foundation of a college at Maynooth, supported by public funds but effectively under the control of the catholic bishops. No restrictions were imposed by parliament on the admission of students save that they should be catholics; but the bishops were reluctant to include lay students and it was as a seminary for the training of the catholic clergy that Maynooth soon became a great national institution.

The arrangements for the higher education of the catholic clergy in



a denominational college were vigorously attacked by a group of catholic laymen, who objected to the exclusively episcopal control over studies at Maynooth, to the absence of competitive examination in the appointment of professors, and to the exclusion of other than catholic students. This last, they said, was highly inexpedient as tending 'to perpetuate that line of separation between his majesty's subjects of different religions which . . . it is the interest of the country to obliterate'. On the other hand they warmly approved of the 'opening' of Trinity College, which enabled them to have their sons educated in common with the protestant youth of Ireland.

Such sentiments were not shared by presbyterians, who continued to regard Trinity College as an anglican preserve and found that it was cheaper to go to Scotland, as they had long been accustomed to do, rather than to Dublin for university education. Identified as they were with radical and republican principles, presbyterians were out of favour with the government. When, on the foundation of Maynooth, they demanded similar provision for their own clergy they were informed that the Maynooth settlement was *sui generis*. In 1799 a scheme for an Ulster university, which was to cater equally for anglicans and dissenters and for which a substantial sum had been bequeathed by Primate Rokeby, was rejected by the government as not being in the public interest. It was more important to encourage Irish students to go to England than to found a second university, which would be injurious to Trinity College and objectionable to Oxford and Cambridge. The government could not endow divinity professors whose doctrines were opposed to those that the state was bound to maintain. If the government had done just this in Maynooth, it was because the catholic clergy were in so very exceptional a position.

Rebuffed by the state, Ulster presbyterians endeavoured to solve their problem, both for the laity and the clergy, by the foundation in 1810 of the Belfast Academical Institution, the product of local and voluntary enterprise. It consisted of a school department and a collegiate department, the latter including an arts faculty and a medical faculty, and serving the purpose of a university college on a small scale. It was entirely free from religious tests and provided no teaching in theological subjects, but allowed such teaching to be provided voluntarily within its walls. Thus professors of divinity for both the orthodox and the non-subscribing presbyterian bodies came to be installed at the Institution. It received a small annual grant from parliament, and though seldom out of difficulties, financial and other, it went a long way towards solving the practical problem of university education for Ulster presbyterians. The difficulty that was never removed, and that inflicted great damage and discredit on the Institution, was the growth of sectarian controversy between orthodox and non-subscribing presbyterians—a peculiarly ironic development for a college that prided itself on being non-sectarian. The non-subscribers, though numerically weak in Ulster,

were intellectually formidable, and they had a controlling influence in the Institution.

### 1845-50

The primary problem in 1845 was the higher education of the laity and especially of the catholic laity. Their difficulty was not so much that Trinity College was protestant as that its offices and emoluments were closed to them. There was a legal *dubium* as to foundation scholarships, and this was made the subject of litigation in 1844-5 that attained great celebrity and in which the catholic plaintiff lost. It was the dissatisfaction of the catholic laity with this situation that impelled the government to make a new effort to solve the university question.

The spokesman and leader of catholic opinion on the question in the thirties and forties was a distinguished educational reformer, Sir Thomas Wyse. He made an elaborate study of the problem of education in a mixed community and propounded a comprehensive scheme for a national system in Ireland on the primary, secondary and university levels. He believed firmly in 'mixed' or 'united' education, the education of catholics and protestants in the same institutions on the basis of combined secular and separate religious instruction. This principle was applied to the system of national primary schools which, largely through Wyse's efforts, was introduced by the whigs in 1831. The national schools were welcomed by the catholic clergy as being free from the proselytizing aims of the institutions that they replaced, and they proved a great social boon. But within ten years the system came to be regarded with deep suspicion by many of the catholic prelates. They considered, not without reason, that it was not being administered with strict adherence to its own cardinal principle of religious neutrality. So mixed education, which they had accepted as a practical expedient though they could not approve of it in theory, became a highly contentious issue. In the forties many of the bishops still supported it, but many others were its implacable opponents.

Among presbyterians, too, mixed education came under a cloud owing to the controversies that distracted the Belfast Academical Institution. In 1844 the general assembly of the presbyterian church decided that it could no longer risk having its candidates for the ministry educated at the Institution, and that it was essential to obtain a seminary under its own control where such candidates could receive a complete education—in both arts and theology—and which would also be open to the laity. It was agreed that an appeal for funds to establish such a seminary should be launched and that government help should also be sought.

By this time Wyse's long campaign for university reform had convinced Sir Robert Peel that some action must be taken by the government and that Wyse's scheme of provincial colleges on the principle of

mixed education was sound. Peel had now embarked on a policy of conciliation for Ireland in the hope of detaching the more thinking elements among the catholics from the repeal movement, which under O'Connell's leadership had developed into a great and menacing agitation. Neither he nor Wyse seems to have realized how great was the distrust that mixed education had aroused among the catholic prelates and how much it had fallen into discredit among presbyterians. Peel's inclinations were all in favour of universities of the Oxford and Cambridge type, which were completely identified with the established church. But for Ireland, where conditions were so very different, he came to believe that non-sectarian colleges were the best compromise attainable and the largest concession that parliament would approve for the laity. He knew that protestant susceptibilities would be sufficiently inflamed by the increased grant that he intended to make to Maynooth, which was in serious financial difficulties and for which the catholic bishops had privately appealed to the government for help. He was prepared to face a protestant uproar over Maynooth, since the principle of state support for this exclusively clerical college had been sanctioned by long precedent. Either parliament should withdraw the college's grant, which was unthinkable, or it should raise it to a level at which the college could be adequately maintained. But it would be a very different matter to ask parliament to provide sectarian colleges for the laity. And the problem was complicated by the fact that, though Peel was primarily concerned to win over the catholics, the situation in Belfast compelled him to devise a scheme that would cater at the same time for catholics and presbyterians.

The two great measures of conciliation carried by the Peel ministry in 1845, the Maynooth act and the provincial colleges act, were the joint work of Peel and his closest colleague, Sir James Graham, the home secretary. The former act gave Maynooth College a large capital sum for much-needed building and increased its annual grant from £9000 to £26,000. Despite the flood of protestant denunciation that accompanied its passage through parliament, the act substantially achieved its purpose; and Maynooth was not to be a factor in the university question for many years to come. On the other hand the colleges act was the starting-point for a new and more embittered phase of the question.

Preliminary soundings on the possibility of making catholics eligible for scholarships in Trinity College or of founding new colleges in the University of Dublin had shown that any interference in that quarter would throw the whole Church of Ireland interest into violent hostility to the government. It was therefore decided to leave Trinity untouched and to establish three new colleges: one at Cork and one at Galway, mainly for catholics, and one at Belfast, mainly for presbyterians, which would replace the collegiate department of the Institution. Consistency pointed to the need for a fourth college, in Dublin, to cater for catholics



unable on financial grounds to attend Trinity College. But the considerations that had caused the government not to interfere with Trinity also ensured that Trinity was not to be embarrassed by the presence of a rival college in the capital.

The new colleges, which were incorporated on a common plan in December 1845 as the Queen's Colleges, were undenominational: like the Belfast Academical Institution—and University College, London—they were free from religious tests and were forbidden to use their public endowment for theological teaching, which, however, might be provided on a voluntary basis by private endowment. In practice no private endowment was ever given for this purpose, though a Church of Ireland scheme to found divinity lectureships in the colleges almost came to fruition. The colleges were non-residential, and the religious and moral supervision of students who lived in lodgings was entrusted to deans of residences for the several denominations, but as no salary was attached to the office the system of supervision never worked satisfactorily. All the teaching work of the colleges was conducted by professors, as in the Scottish universities. There were three faculties, arts, law and medicine, in each college, and the system of studies was comprehensive and up-to-date. Fees were low, and a substantial part (£1500) of the income of each college was allocated to scholarships and prizes. A capital sum of £100,000 was voted for buildings, and each college was given an annual endowment of £7000 from the consolidated fund.

British public opinion offered no serious opposition to the colleges scheme. In Ireland, unionist opinion supported the government while nationalist opinion was divided on the question of mixed education. O'Connell, borrowing a phrase with which Sir Robert Inglis had damned the bill in parliament, vehemently denounced the 'godless colleges', whereas Young Ireland welcomed them as a means of promoting two of their most cherished ideals—an educated and self-reliant laity and a union among Irishmen of different religions. The catholic prelates were also divided: one section led by the primate, Archbishop Murray, was anxious to give the colleges a fair chance; the other, led by Archbishop MacHale of Tuam, was incurably hostile. The prelates declared that they were prepared to co-operate with the government if the scheme were amended on a number of crucial points. (1) A fair proportion of the professors and other officers should be catholics approved by their bishops. (2) All officers should be appointed by a board of trustees, which should include the catholic prelates of the province and be empowered to dismiss any officer convicted of seeking to undermine the faith or morals of students. (3) There should be catholic professors of history, logic, metaphysics, moral philosophy, geology and anatomy for catholic students. (4) Catholic chaplains to superintend the moral and religious instruction of catholics should be appointed at a suitable salary. Peel refused to budge on any of these points, regarding them as incompatible with the principle of his scheme. The sequel was that after

a protracted struggle among the prelates and rival missions to Rome, the Queen's Colleges were condemned by Pope Pius IX as intrinsically dangerous to the faith and morals of catholics. Three papal rescripts (1847, 1848 and 1850) against the colleges were rounded off by decrees of a national synod of the Irish church held at Thurles in 1850. The hierarchy thereafter presented a united front against the colleges and prepared to found a university of their own, which took shape in 1854 as the Catholic University of Ireland, under the rectorship of John Henry Newman.

The prelates' hostility had a permanently stunting effect on Queen's College, Cork, and Queen's College, Galway, which never realized the purposes of their founders, though they were far from being a total failure. Queen's College, Belfast, was in quite a different position. In Ulster the population from which university students were recruited was almost entirely protestant; and the most important institution of protestant Ulster, the presbyterian church, found it desirable from the outset to co-operate with the local Queen's College.

The presbyterian general assembly was scarcely less anxious to control higher education in Ulster than the catholic bishops were in the south and west, but with the significant difference that it was concerned mainly about the education of its clergy. Ideally the assembly wanted a college that would provide teaching in both arts and theology, and that would be under its own control though supported by the state; and in 1846 a valuable bequest from a Mrs Magee opened up the possibility of realizing this ideal. But the establishment of a Queen's College in Belfast cut right across the assembly's plan; for the government had no intention of endowing an arts faculty in a presbyterian college when it had provided adequately for such a faculty in Queen's College, though it was prepared to endow an exclusively theological college for presbyterians. The general assembly became deeply and bitterly divided over this issue. Eventually a majority agreed to recognize the Belfast Queen's College as suitable for the general education of candidates for the ministry and to rest content with state endowment of a theological college under the assembly's control. On this basis, and because the professors appointed by the crown were as a whole acceptable to the general assembly, presbyterian students freely attended Queen's College, Belfast, which soon had as many students as the Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway combined. A presbyterian theological college was duly established at Belfast in 1853, and grew up in close and friendly relations with Queen's College. On the other hand, an intractable minority in the general assembly insisted on going on with the plan for a 'complete college'; and enabled to do so by so much of Mrs Magee's bequest as did not fall into the hands of lawyers, they founded such a college—in Ulster, but as far from Belfast as possible. It was thus that Magee College began a rather precarious existence at Londonderry in 1865.

Mixed or non-sectarian education proved a conspicuous success at Queen's College, Belfast, so far as the protestant churches were concerned. Presbyterians, anglicans, methodists and others worked harmoniously together as students, and ministers of their respective churches acted as deans of residences. Catholics did not exceed five per cent of the student body, but they were well thought of and included some of the ablest students the college ever had. In an atmosphere of mutual respect for religious diversity the non-sectarian principle became an honoured tradition at Belfast. Hostile critics contended that 'non-sectarian' was synonymous with 'presbyterian', and it was true that sixty-five per cent of the college's students were presbyterians and that all three of its presidents were presbyterian clergymen. But there is no evidence of any ecclesiastical interference with the college, or of any special preference for presbyterians in appointments to chairs. Presbyterians were indeed always in a minority among the professors.

The Queen's Colleges scheme was completed in 1850 by the creation of a new university, the Queen's University in Ireland. Peel and Graham had felt that by far the best way of giving the new colleges a university connection would be to include them within the University of Dublin; but, warned off that solution by their awareness of anglican opposition, they had contemplated a new university on the London model, that is, an essentially examining body with numerous affiliated institutions. They had talked with enthusiasm of Maynooth students competing for academic laurels with presbyterians from Belfast and with catholics and anglicans from Cork and Galway. In 1849-50, though out of office, they were fully consulted about the proposed new university by Lord Clarendon, Lord John Russell's Irish viceroy, and their advice went far to decide him against giving each of the Queen's Colleges the power of granting degrees, on the model, favoured by Lord John, of the Scottish universities. But Clarendon took a different line on the question of admitting to the examinations and degrees of the Queen's University students other than those educated in the Queen's Colleges. For he considered that, applied to Ireland, the London system would result in a lowering of standards to the level of the smaller and inferior affiliated bodies; and by facilitating the catholic hierarchy in their scheme for a catholic university would increase their power to injure the nascent Queen's Colleges. So the Queen's University in Ireland was designed as a teaching university, in the sense that only students educated in one of its three colleges might obtain its degrees. Empowered to prescribe all courses leading to degrees and diplomas and to conduct all examinations for the purpose, it exercised a decisive control over the colleges. This it used to maintain high and uniform standards, and its degrees soon earned a good reputation.



1873-82

The settlement of 1845-50, from a protestant standpoint, was on the whole satisfactory; its only serious drawback was that the colleges were kept on a very tight rein financially. But though about a quarter of the students were catholics, the colleges were the object of constant and fierce attack from the catholic clergy, supported increasingly by the laity. To the hierarchy it was intolerable that some £30,000 of public money was annually spent on these infidel institutions while their own Catholic University was left to struggle unrecognized and unaided by the state. The action of Trinity College in 1854 in establishing non-foundation scholarships, open to catholics, gave the prelates less than no satisfaction, though it met a demand from catholic laymen. For now that there was a catholic university, Trinity College was virtually banned to catholics. What the prelates claimed was that university education should be placed within the reach of catholics through institutions as acceptable to them as Trinity College was to protestants. This in practice meant not only state recognition and state endowment for the Catholic University but interference with the existing constitution of the Queen's University and its colleges, and especially the conversion of the latter into denominational institutions.

These claims were pressed insistently on the government by the hierarchy, under the leadership of Cardinal Cullen, archbishop of Dublin; and from 1865 onwards ministers both whig and conservative toyed with the problem of doing something to help the Catholic University without violating the principle that the state must not in future create or endow any denominational institution in Ireland—a principle that seemed to be finally established by Gladstone's Irish church act of 1869, which ended all connection between the state and the churches, including the annual grants to Maynooth College and to the presbyterian church. Negotiations between the hierarchy and the government in the late sixties ended in failure and disappointment, and served to intensify protestant, and especially presbyterian, support of the non-sectarian principle and of the Queen's University system. The defence of that university now began to be undertaken by its graduates, foremost among them Belfast Queensmen. An attempt by the Russell administration in 1865-6 to alter the constitution of the Queen's University by a supplemental charter enabling candidates to obtain the university's degrees without having attended any of the Queen's Colleges produced an uprush of hostile opinion. The main protestant denominations presented something like a united front against any such concession to catholic demands and graduates of the Queen's University resorted to legal proceedings (1866-7), the effect of which was to render the supplemental charter inoperative. Yet what that charter aimed at was no more than Peel and Graham had contemplated in 1845.

The university question was thus more embittered than ever when

Gladstone made his characteristic attempt to solve it in 1873. He proposed to abolish the Queen's University and Queen's College, Galway and to set up a great new national and non-sectarian university, which would both teach and examine and to which sectarian and non-sectarian colleges alike might be affiliated, subject to certain educational qualifications. The University of Dublin, detached from Trinity College, was to form the nucleus of this university, of which the affiliated colleges were to include Trinity College, the Catholic University so-called, the Queen's Colleges of Belfast and Cork, and Magee College, Londonderry. The new university was to have a teaching staff of its own and an annual endowment of £50,000, towards which Trinity College was to contribute £15,000; but while the surviving Queen's Colleges were to retain their grants, there was to be endowment for the Catholic University. This bold and comprehensive plan marked a new departure in the treatment of the problem, combining as it did the old idea of enlarging the University of Dublin with ingenious arrangements to suit new conditions. But, though it had the powerful support of Cardinal Manning, the measure antagonized Irish catholics scarcely less than it did Trinity College and the Queen's University; and it was defeated in the commons by the votes of Irish members, catholic and protestant. Its defeat led at once to the passing of Fawcett's Act, which, with the approval of the governing body of Trinity College and against strong opposition from Irish catholic members, abolished religious tests for all the offices and emoluments of Trinity College and the University of Dublin (except in the divinity school). This, in the eyes of the catholic prelates, reduced Trinity College to almost the same low level as the Queen's Colleges and increased rather than mitigated catholic grievances.

The rise of a home rule party in the house of commons in the seventies ensured that catholic claims on the university issue would be increasingly forced upon the attention of parliament. The defeat of Gladstone's university bill involved the overthrow of his government; and his successor, Disraeli, found himself obliged to take up the question, though he waited till a general election was in sight before doing so. Taught by experience, he left the three Queen's Colleges, Trinity College and the University of Dublin untouched, but his university education act of 1879 provided for the abolition of the Queen's University and its replacement by a purely examining university on the London model. The Royal University of Ireland, incorporated in 1880, was empowered to grant degrees (except in medicine) to all persons who had passed the examinations prescribed by its senate, whether or not they had pursued courses of study in a university college. For medical degrees, attendance at approved medical schools was obligatory. Funds were provided by parliament for university buildings and £20,000 a year for exhibitions, scholarships and fellowships to be awarded in subjects of secular education.

On the face of it this scheme conformed to the non-sectarian principle and offered little satisfaction to catholics. The abolition of the Queen's University was in a sense only the logical consequence of the successful resistance of Queensmen to the supplemental charter. But in fact the scheme differed fundamentally from its predecessors in that it provided for the indirect endowment of the Catholic University. The statutes of the Royal University, confirmed by the crown in November 1881, authorized the senate to select university fellows, not exceeding 29, on condition that they taught matriculated students in some approved educational institution. The fellows were to conduct the university examination and to receive a salary of £400 unless they already had a salary from some other university or from some college endowed from public funds, in which case they were to receive only so much as would bring their salaries from both sources to £400 a year. The senate, consisting largely of crown nominees, arranged to assign half the fellowships to professors in the arts faculty of the Catholic University (known from 1882 as University College, Dublin) and the remainder to the three Queen's Colleges and to Magee College, Londonderry. This meant an eventual endowment of about £6000 a year to the University College, £400 to Magee College, and an addition of about £1200 to the endowment of the Queen's Colleges. In this way the principle that public money must not be used to subsidize sectarian institutions was set aside, though not openly or explicitly. The fellowship system rescued University College, Dublin, from a situation that had become desperate, and started it on a new career in which it became the rival of the Queen's Colleges for the rewards of the Royal University. The solitary fellowship assigned to Magee College was the symbol of a university connection such as it had hitherto hoped for in vain and from which it benefited greatly.

Though for catholics the Royal University was an immense improvement on the Queen's University, it fell far short of the university to which in justice they felt entitled. To Queensmen, on the other hand, it was a highly distasteful substitute for the university it replaced. They had made strenuous efforts to save the Queen's University, in virtue both of the high quality of the education it dispensed and of its non-sectarian character. But the situation was essentially different from that of 1873 in that the catholics as a body supported Disraeli's scheme and that Trinity College was not opposed to it. Gladstone, on whom it devolved, in 1880, either to annul or to carry out the scheme, felt that he could not go back upon so recent a decision of parliament. So, to the indignation of its graduates, the Queen's University was dissolved in 1882. The Queen's Colleges ceased to be the constituent colleges of a teaching university and became colleges of indeterminate status loosely connected with a university that was merely an examining machine. On the senate of the Queen's University the presidents of the Queen's Colleges had formed the core of a body preponderantly protestant, which



had existed only to serve the interests of the colleges; on the senate of the Royal University they and other representatives of the colleges were heavily outnumbered by members representing other, and more especially catholic, interests. The Queen's Colleges, and especially Queen's College, Belfast, claimed that in the university examinations their students were placed at a disadvantage in comparison with those of the Catholic University.

Yet, for an institution born in compromise and shapen in obliquity, the Royal University had great merits. For the first time, students of all denominations, from every part of Ireland, and of both sexes, presented themselves for the same examinations and competed for valuable exhibitions, prizes and scholarships. Though the Queen's Colleges with their systematic courses of study and their stringent attendance-requirements were brought into undesirable competition with institutions and private tutors whose interest lay in cramming rather than in educating, they also engaged in healthy rivalry with comparable institutions, and most significantly with University College, Dublin, which quickly earned a high reputation both for the quality of its teaching and the prowess of its students. For all its defects the Royal University gave great and timely stimulus to higher education in Ireland just when intermediate education was entering on a new era under the system of state support established by the intermediate education act of 1878.

Nevertheless the Royal University was regarded both by catholics and protestants as only a temporary expedient, and its twenty-seven years were marked by incessant and frequently envenomed controversy.

### 1901-8

Growing dissatisfaction with the Royal University led to the formation of new schemes for the settlement of the university question. The catholic claim to equality of treatment with protestants was voiced with great force and distinction by William Walsh, archbishop of Dublin (1885-1921), who in 1890 proposed, as alternative plans of settlement acceptable to catholics: (1) one state-recognized university embracing all colleges fulfilling certain educational conditions (the Gladstone plan); (2) two state-recognized universities, one of them the University of Dublin, enlarged to include a catholic college in Dublin along with Trinity College, the other a modified Royal University; (3) three state-recognized universities, one of them the University of Dublin in its existing form, the second a catholic university with its principal college in Dublin, the third a university for protestant dissenters, based on Queen's College, Belfast. Acceptance of any of these plans would be subject to three conditions: (*a*) there must be a public endowment for a catholic college in Dublin, equal in status and advantages with Trinity College; (*b*) the Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway must be so reformed as to make them fully acceptable to catholics; (*c*) catholics

must have an equitable representation on the senate or governing body of the university proposed in the first plan, or of the two universities proposed in the second, or of the catholic university proposed in the third.

To each of these plans there was invincible protestant opposition. Protestant opinion in Ireland and Great Britain was profoundly hostile to any public endowment of a catholic university or college, and this affected all three plans. The whole anglican and Trinity College interest objected strongly to the first and second plans as subversive of the historic character of Trinity College. And presbyterians in general disapproved of the idea of a separate university for Ulster. The president of Queen's College, Belfast, Rev. Josias Leslie Porter, though himself a presbyterian minister, was quite untypical of the presbyterian majority when, in two confidential memoranda submitted to the Irish government in 1885 and 1888, he argued that the only real solution of the university problem was to replace the Royal University with a teaching university for catholics, publicly endowed and fully equipped, and to convert Queen's College, Belfast, into an Ulster university, leaving Trinity College untouched. This was an anticipation of Archbishop Walsh's third plan. Against the idea of an Ulster university, leading graduates of Queen's College contended at a public meeting in 1888 that neither in intellectual nor in physical resources was Ulster capable of maintaining a university that would not be stamped with provincialism; that it was better to maintain the Royal University than to supersede it by three sectarian universities and put an end to that nation-wide competition among Irishmen so stimulating to their mental powers; and that it would be grossly inconsistent for presbyterians who had supported the disendowment of the Church of Ireland to lend themselves to a new endowment of the Catholic University.

In August 1889, A. J. Balfour, then chief secretary for Ireland, admitted in the house of commons that nothing parliament had done to promote higher education in Ireland really met the wants of the catholics. This produced a storm of criticism, especially from Scotland, which Balfour sought to allay by a speech at Partick, near Glasgow, in December, in which he announced that he intended to take no action on the question unless, among other antecedent conditions, he was supported by the public opinion of Scotland, as well as of England and of Ireland. The way to a further move was eased by a statement issued by the catholic prelates on 23 June 1897: the catholic claim, they declared, did not require the imposition of religious tests, or a preponderance of clergy on the governing body, or the endowment of a theological faculty out of public funds, in any college or university to be established by the state for catholics. Two years later, as leader of the house of commons in the Salisbury administration, Balfour outlined a scheme of settlement very much on the lines of President Porter's memorandum of 1888: Trinity College being left undisturbed and the Royal Univer-

sity dissolved, two new universities should be created, at Dublin and Belfast, with precisely similar constitutions. Both were to be technically undenominational, but the new university at Dublin would serve the needs of catholics as that at Belfast would serve those of presbyterians. A university for catholics but not a Catholic University was the essence of Balfour's scheme. It was welcomed by catholics but was withdrawn in face of angry opinion in Britain.

In 1901 the Salisbury government appointed a royal commission, under the chairmanship of Lord Robertson, to investigate the condition of university education in Ireland outside Trinity College. The commission collected a large body of evidence and its report, issued in 1903, recommended the conversion of the Royal University into a teaching university, with four constituent colleges, the three Queen's Colleges and a catholic college at Dublin. The Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway were to be reformed so as to make them more acceptable to catholics, and the new catholic college was to be equipped and maintained on a high level by the state. But these recommendations were still-born. The majority report was accompanied by separate statements from nearly all the commissioners, expressing qualifications and criticisms that fatally weakened it; and the exclusion of Trinity College from the inquiry, by preventing the commissioners from considering any settlement involving the University of Dublin, detracted very seriously from the value of their findings. This failure induced the government to attempt a fresh approach to the problem. In the autumn of 1903 George Wyndham, the Irish chief secretary, in consultation with the under-secretary, Sir Anthony MacDonnell, and Archbishop Walsh, drafted a scheme which was published in the press in January 1904 over the name of Lord Dunraven. It proposed to bring within the University of Dublin, Queen's College, Belfast and a new college for catholics to be founded in Dublin under the name King's College. Both these colleges were to be well-equipped, autonomous, and residential, 'with governing bodies selected exclusively on academical grounds'. This 'Dunraven scheme' was well received by catholic opinion but found little favour among protestants and was soon abandoned by Balfour's government, which had little steam left in it by 1904.

On the return of the liberals to power in January 1906, Asquith's government hastened to appoint a commission, under the chairmanship of Sir Edward Fry, to enquire into Trinity College and the University of Dublin as a step towards a general settlement of the university question. Its report, issued in January 1907, amounted to an endorsement of the Dunraven scheme: the commissioners recommended that a new college acceptable to catholics should be created in Dublin and a majority of them wanted this and the Queen's Colleges to be constituent colleges of the University of Dublin along with Trinity College. While the Fry commission was sitting, James Bryce, the chief secretary, was preparing a scheme on similar lines, and shortly after the commission had reported



he announced (January 1907) his plan of settlement—the enlargement of the University of Dublin to include, with Trinity College, the Queen's Colleges of Belfast and Cork and a catholic college in Dublin; this university to be non-sectarian, and to provide teaching in non-controversial subjects, the constituent colleges providing alternative classes for protestants and catholics in controversial subjects; Queen's College, Galway, Maynooth College, and Magee College, Londonderry, to be associated with the university as 'affiliated institutions'. This plan—a revised version of Gladstone's—was accepted by the catholic bishops, by the presbyterian general assembly, and by the Royal University. Queen's College, Belfast, dissented, apprehensive of an unequal partnership with Trinity College. But what killed the Bryce scheme was not the opposition of a provincial college but a vociferous and well-organized 'hands off Trinity' campaign conducted throughout the British Isles and led by Ulster unionists in the house of commons. So Bryce's retirement from the chief secretaryship to become British ambassador at Washington (January 1907) marked the abandonment of his plan.

Nevertheless there was a large and influential element in Trinity College anxious to go to the limit in making concessions to catholics while preserving the historic connection between Trinity College and the University of Dublin. A statement, signed by twelve junior fellows and eight professors, which, with the approval of the provost, Anthony Traill, and the goodwill of many other members of the staff, was presented to the Fry commission in July 1906, proposed elaborate safeguards for the faith and morals of catholic students and guarantees of catholic interests. There was to be an advisory committee of six catholics, including two bishops, to watch over catholic students; dual professorships of philosophy and of history; provision for the religious instruction of catholic students by their own clergy; a catholic chapel within the walls; a catholic faculty of theology if the bishops desired it; and measures to ensure adequate representation for catholics on the governing body of the college. An influential committee of catholic laymen welcomed this proposal, and Provost Traill believed that, though it would encounter strong resistance within the college, it would command the support of a majority if it were known to be acceptable to the catholics. But the catholic bishops rejected the plan utterly: 'under no circumstances will the catholics of Ireland accept a system of mixed education in Trinity College as a solution of their claims' (25 July 1906). This was decisive. Yet the professor of theology at Maynooth, Rev. Walter McDonald, one of the most remarkable Irishmen of his day, considered that the Trinity offer should have been accepted; and he was convinced that, if it had been put to the free vote of the catholic body, there would have been a strong majority, lay and clerical, in favour of regarding it as a basis of discussion likely to lead to a satisfactory settlement.

The final settlement, the work of Bryce's successor, Augustine Birrell,

was based on Balfour's proposals of 1899, though it incorporated some features of Bryce's plan. There were to be two new universities, one centred at Dublin, for catholics, one at Belfast, for protestants, but both free from religious tests and both debarred from using their public endowment for religious purposes. The university centred at Dublin was to take over the Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway as constituent colleges, and was to be linked with Maynooth as a recognized college. The scheme was carefully worked out and the ground well prepared for its acceptance. Archbishop Walsh was consulted at every stage and this assured catholic approval. Trinity College, which the scheme left wholly untouched, was entirely favourable, and the governing body of Queen's College, Belfast, approved of it. It received conservative support in parliament as being in essence a conservative measure. The only persistent opposition came from Ulster unionists: the presbyterian general assembly expressed disapproval of the measure as contrary to the non-sectarian principle, and in the unionist press the proposed creation of an Ulster university was bluntly condemned as part of a scheme for satisfying 'the monstrous demands of the Roman hierarchy'. In parliament the Ulster unionist members fought Birrell's bill through all its stages, their future leader, Sir Edward Carson, voting against them. But the bill was carried by overwhelming majorities, and before the end of the year the National University of Ireland and the Queen's University of Belfast were formally brought into existence by royal charters.

The decision to extinguish the Royal University faced Magee College, Londonderry, with the problem of finding an alternative university connection. Negotiations with Birrell appeared to have ensured that the affiliation of the college to the new University of Belfast would be specifically provided for in the bill. But the general assembly's opposition to the bill altered the situation, and the bill was passed without the addition of a clause relating to Magee College. In their disappointment and chagrin the authorities of Magee College decided not to seek recognition from the University of Belfast, as they were entitled to do, but succeeded in making an advantageous arrangement with a very different body, the University of Dublin. As a result, since 1909 Magee students have been enabled to graduate in that university after pursuing the great part of the arts course in their own college and the balance in Trinity College.

In 1793 Ireland had one university, the University of Dublin; in 1908 she had the University of Dublin and three others, of which the Catholic University led only a formal existence and was not recognized by the state. The two universities founded in 1908 were endowed with an annual income from the state, no part of which might be used to maintain places of worship or religious teaching. The two new universities and the University of Dublin were entirely free from religious tests,

except that certain offices in the divinity school of Trinity College were reserved to anglican clergymen. Of the three denominational colleges on university level founded since 1793, Maynooth was connected with the National University as a 'recognized college', Magee was attached by a special arrangement to Trinity College, and the Presbyterian College, Belfast, was to become formally linked with the Queen's University of Belfast as a 'recognized college' in 1927.

On the whole, British policy on the university question since 1845 had endeavoured to follow the theory that the state ought not to endow denominational teaching for the laity. Disraeli's compromise of 1879 satisfied neither the champions nor the enemies of the denominational principle. The settlement of 1908 was a compromise also, but a more self-respecting one, and rendered the more successful because since 1897 the catholic bishops had ceased to insist on the strict denominationalism they had formerly demanded. While treating catholics and protestants on a completely equal footing, the act of 1908 created two universities which, under parallel constitutions, allowed wide scope for the contrasting ideals of the two religions and ensured continuity with institutions already well rooted.

The new universities were endowed by parliament much more generously than the institutions they replaced. The university centred at Dublin and its constituent colleges were to have £74,000 a year, and the university at Belfast £28,000 a year. There was also a capital grant of £170,000 for the former university and of £60,000 for the latter.

The National University of Ireland, without being a catholic university, was intended as a university for catholics and went far to fulfil the needs and expectations of the catholic laity. It was firmly based in Dublin on University College and the St Cecilia Street Medical School, both of them offspring of the Catholic University, and in Cork and Galway on their respective Queen's Colleges, renamed University College, Cork, and University College, Galway. The federal constitution devised for the National University owed little to the Royal University but followed the pattern of the former Queen's University in Ireland, the Victoria University of Manchester, and the National University of Wales, in providing for a true teaching university, granting degrees only to candidates who had satisfactorily completed prescribed courses of study within its constituent colleges.

The Queen's University of Belfast was the continuation of Queen's College, Belfast, and took over both the name and the non-sectarian tradition of the Queen's University in Ireland. The catholic ban on Queen's as a college ceased to operate when it became a university and, as a symbol of goodwill, instituted a department of scholastic philosophy, with a catholic priest in charge. The percentage of catholic students quickly rose to a substantial figure, and though presbyterians have remained by far the most numerous denomination the ideal of



united education, so hopefully cherished by the founders of the Belfast Academical Institution, has been abundantly realized at Belfast.

In each of the critical phases of the university question since 1795 both the major parties in British politics were involved and each tended to build upon the work of the other. Each major attempt at settlement till 1906 was the work of an expiring government; the settlement of 1908 was the work of a liberal government recently returned to office with a strong majority, and it has proved by far the most lasting.

Of the three types of settlement of the university question already envisaged by 1793, the first (the 'opening' of Trinity College) and the third (the creation of new university institutions) had been carried into effect by 1908. The 'opening' of Trinity College, once demanded by the catholics, had been increasingly frowned upon by the bishops since 1850, but the 'opening' of the University of Dublin, which was the second possible type of settlement, had been strongly urged by them, and was still looked upon in 1908 as in many ways the best solution. It was in principle the solution favoured by Wyse, by Peel and Gladstone, by Wyndham, MacDonnell and Bryce, and by Archbishop Walsh. Its defeat after repeated struggles was due primarily to the embattled resistance of Trinity College and the anglican interest, but was due also, though to a much lesser extent, to the unwillingness of Ulster presbyterians to see their college unequally yoked with Trinity College. The defeat of every project for a greater University of Dublin destroyed the hope of an all-inclusive national university; and the university settlement of 1908, so tenaciously resisted by Ulster unionists, was in a profoundly significant sense the prelude to the partition of Ireland in 1921.

---

# POLITICAL LEADERSHIP IN THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY<sup>1</sup>

---

MAX BELOFF

*All Souls College, Oxford*

THE STUDY of how political leadership is exercised in a democracy is one of permanent interest to the political scientist and one in which he may reasonably expect assistance from the historian. The United States presents a particularly fruitful field for investigation partly because its history as a mass-democracy is longer than that of any other country, and partly because the great size of the country and its federal structure involve problems of leadership on a number of different levels. Fortunately, the importance of the problem is equalled only by the abundance of the material for its solution. The size of the country itself has always meant that more political business had to be transacted in writing than was necessary in the tighter-knit and more centralized political world of, for instance, Victorian England with its house-parties and its clubland. The telephone may, in the United States as elsewhere, have been the historian's enemy; but the size of the Roosevelt archives suggests that its consequences for the written record have not yet been catastrophic. Furthermore, as every preface to an American historical work reveals, the accumulation and collection of archives, national, State, local and family, is an important and efficient American industry—and with few and diminishing exceptions all this material is placed freely at the historian's disposal. Without the Middle Ages to dominate the attention and resources of the local archivists as well as of University departments of history, the United States can concentrate all its attention upon its own relatively short history and devote to the political intrigues and manœuvres of a single State the attention which we reserve for the mysteries of manor and monastery. It is not sur-

<sup>1</sup> *James K. Polk, Jacksonian, 1795-1843*, by James K. Sellers. Princeton University Press; London: O.U.P. 1957. ix + 526 pp. 60s.

*The Early Jackson Party in Ohio*, by Harry R. Stevens. Duke University Press; Cambridge University Press. 1957. xi + 186 pp. 34s.

*James Shepherd Pike*, by R. F. Durden. Duke University Press; Cambridge University Press. 1957. ix + 249 pp. 37s. 6d.

*Wilson: The New Freedom*, by Arthur S. Link. Princeton University Press; London: O.U.P. 1956. ix + 504 pp. 60s.

*The Crisis of the Old Order, 1919-1933*, by Arthur M. Schlesinger, jun. London: Heinemann. 1957. xi + 569 pp. 42s.

prising that the development of American political leadership should be a study constantly renewed by new publications, or that it should be easier for someone in England limiting himself to what is already in print to find the American Presidency easier to understand than the English premiership, Jacksonian Democracy more accessible than Gladstonian Liberalism.

The problems of political leadership in the age of Jackson are of particular interest because it witnessed the rapid growth of the devices such as the national convention that have since come to be particularly associated with American party life. Attention has been necessarily concentrated upon state as much as upon national politics, since the latter still depended so much upon the former; and it is the interweaving of the two themes that has clearly helped to attract Professor Sellers to write the biography of James K. Polk for the period before he emerged as the successful Democratic Presidential candidate in 1844. The publication of Polk's diary and of McCormac's 'political biography' long ago removed any impression that Polk was a weak or insignificant President; the present work should also dispel the view that he can be claimed as the first 'dark horse' to win the Presidency for the Democracy. He emerges as a professional politician with no real life outside politics, but as a man of consuming ambition, at the very centre of things in a crucial State. His ultimate triumph stands, we are told, 'almost unparalleled in the annals of American politics, as an achievement of modest endowments, coupled with extraordinary determination and self-discipline'. The self-discipline in the conditions imposed by the personal canvassing and mammoth speech-making of the day had to be physical as much as intellectual—Polk was never strong and died comparatively young. And Tennessee, whose emergence from frontier conditions was a fact of Polk's own lifetime, was not an easy State to get about, before the railways and with few good roads. One can understand the interest of the politicians in 'internal improvements'. As Polk wrote to Van Buren:

the labour of canvassing a state like this, of more than six hundred miles in extent, and reaching from the mountains of Virginia and Carolina to the Swamps of the Mississippi, and of visiting and addressing the people in more than eighty Counties is greater than can be estimated by any one who has not performed it. It requires four months of unceasing riding and speaking.

And there were few years that were not election years.

Like other biographers, Professor Sellers claims a good deal for his hero. He asserts that Polk was the first speaker of the national House of Representatives 'to be regarded frankly as a party leader responsible for pushing a party programme through the House', and again that 'he was the first governor of Tennessee to function as legislative leader of his party'. These remarks may give the impression that legislative programmes were more weighty than in fact they were. For Polk was



throughout a representative of what he regarded as the true Jeffersonian tradition, modified only by the democratic slant given to it by his patron Andrew Jackson. He stood for negative government which should maintain in being that roughly egalitarian rural society that he looked back to nostalgically as the true America. The more positive ideas, whether of a John Quincy Adams or of a Henry Clay, made no appeal. The main task was thus to prevent legislation conferring special favours on classes or sections, rather than to promote it. This meant that the issues with which Polk was concerned in his pre-Presidential career were few in number and all familiar. The most important of them was the currency question. Professor Sellers acknowledges a debt to Arthur Schlesinger junior's *The Age of Jackson*, but the more local context of his work makes him perhaps more successful in distinguishing between the 'hard money' Democrats of whom Polk was emphatically one and those whose objections to a National Bank were based on their preference for local banks which could more easily assist in the promotion of speculative enterprises. Even so, more might perhaps have been made of the insights of economic history in the stricter sense. More relevant, however, to the problems of leadership with which Polk was to deal during his Presidency—with the great depression of the late 1830's behind the country—was the issue of slavery, and Professor Sellers throws a good deal of light on how it was that someone of Polk's background should have remained so unaware of its explosive potentialities in a more than party sense.

The early 1820's which saw Polk's entry into Tennessee politics were important ones on the national scene. The domination of a single national party which reached its climax with the re-election of James Monroe to the Presidency was challenged with the conflicts over the succession and with the new issues brought into being by westward expansion. During Monroe's second term three political parties on a nation-wide scale were built up to support the rival claims of Adams, Clay and Andrew Jackson—and the Jacksonian party was destined to a long life. The questions that this development poses for the historian are numerous. One that has perhaps been asked insufficiently is how an organization was built up within the States, counties and townships which could both respond to national impulses and leadership and bring out the voters. How, for instance, were the slates of electors compiled? How did the national contest fit in with local rivalries at a time when the latter were so important that in Ohio in 1824 only two-thirds as many of the voters took part in the Presidential contest as had voted in the gubernatorial election a fortnight before?

It is Professor Stevens' conviction that the answers to these and similar questions can only be found in a series of studies made State by State, and party by party, and his present contribution confines itself to Ohio in these years, and except for purposes of illustration and comparison to the Jacksonian party which actually ran second to Clay's

supporters in 1824. Apart from a couple of introductory chapters which help to set the Ohio scene and give some indication of the personal and social background of a few of the leading figures, Mr. Stevens' study sticks closely to the questions he is concerned to ask and gives a number of answers, some of them not the less interesting for being negative or incomplete.

What emerges is the picture of a society in which a very large number of persons are prepared to give of their time to filling local and State offices and to provide the cadres from whom the elements of a national party organization can be drawn. They have the habit of organizing meetings, of drawing up resolutions, of setting up committees of correspondence, of taking straw votes and above all of setting up and managing local newspapers for political ends; and the results seem to show that all this activity is significant as to how much of the vote is turned out. On the other hand, although members of all three branches of the State government take an active part, and although this is also true of such branches of the federal administration as are locally represented, patronage or the hope of it seems to play a relatively small role, certainly compared with later times. There is no clear alignment between support for the Presidential rivals and candidates for other office, and some evidence of strong cross-currents. Men seem activated by the knowledge that it will be necessary to find a nationally acceptable Presidential candidate whose fortunes it is safe to embrace; the dispersal of the Clintonians, once it is obvious that Clinton himself will not get the New York nomination, is symptomatic. As regards the followings of the three candidates, there seems very little difference in the social standing or sectional origins of their supporters; urban rather than agricultural activities account for most of the activists. But Mr. Stevens believes that among the younger men there was a greater proportion of more or less professional lawyer-politicians and that these tended to be for Adams or Clay rather than for Jackson. If this could be generally substantiated we would have a useful clue as to the ultimate character of Jacksonian democracy as a conservative movement—as Polk conceived it.

For the period he is dealing with, Mr. Stevens is however convinced that what is important for explaining the building-up of party machinery is the network of personal connections in the widest sense—politics is a part of family, social, religious, recreational and business life. Thus whether one begins with the State level and works downwards, or with the township and works upwards, or whether as with the Jacksonians one begins with small committees at the county level, one's capacity for successful organization depends upon one's personal standing within small communities where 'issues' are less a staple of discussion and interest than human qualities and failings. This means an enormous effort at 'microbiography', if that is the correct word for fitting together the life-histories of persons in themselves of no great interest.

Genealogy and antiquarianism are thus pressed into the service of the study of political leadership—one must hope that Mr. Stevens has found rewarding the enormous amount of detailed research that has obviously gone into this small but suggestive book.

With Professor Durden's biography of James Shepherd Pike we are on ground more familiar to English readers; and for them indeed the most interesting chapters will be those which describe its subject's activities and impressions as Lincoln's minister to Holland. From the present point of view, however, we are concerned with it more for any light it may cast on those breakdowns of American political leadership that first contributed to the onset of the Civil War and then produced the scandals and corruption and bitterness of the 'Reconstruction' era. What interested the author originally was the background of Pike's celebrated work *The Prostrate State: South Carolina under Negro Government*, published in 1873. How did Pike, one of the most prominent anti-slavery journalists of the ante-bellum era, come to write a book which helped to create the mood in the North that made possible the bargain of 1877 and the re-establishment of white domination in the South? The answer would seem to be on two levels. In the first place, as Pike's own notes show, the book on South Carolina developed ideas which he had already expressed before he went there and was not based upon any very detailed or determined effort to get at the truth. Disgusted with 'Grantism', Pike, who had supported his old associate Greeley in 1872, was looking for material with which to criticize the administration and found it in the argument that the corrupt carpet-bag regimes in the South owed their whole existence to federal support. But at another level, it was possible for Pike to take this line because he had always been fundamentally anti-negro, hating the master rather than loving the slave. In the 1850's this attitude allowed him for a period to contemplate disunion as preferable to remaining in a Union where slaveholders would continue to dominate, and again in the crisis of 1860-1 it made him prefer peaceful secession to any possibility of compromise. During the war, he was again prepared, if victory were not attainable on the North's terms, to allow the secession of part of the lower States into which the negroes could be crammed as into a pen. This idea that the solution for the negro problem could not be simply emancipation but must involve some territorial separation, and that the territory so sacrificed should be as small as possible was a recurrent theme in Pike's thought. Thus the advocacy of negro voting rights after the war was simply a part of the strategy of making sure the Republicans stayed in power for reasons not all connected with slavery, and was no concession to any idea about the possible equality of the races. Professor Durden's suggestion that if these ideas were more widespread in the North than has hitherto been noticed, 'the Civil War and Reconstruction eras take on a new dimension of tragedy' is worth reflecting upon; it also helps to make more comprehensible the



history of 'race relations' after emancipation—and indeed in our own times.

The second volume of Professor Link's magisterial biography of Woodrow Wilson covers the first two years of his Presidency, years in which the Democratic Party's plans for reform legislation—the 'New Freedom'—were carried through Congress thanks largely to Wilson's dynamic leadership, only to reveal (if not at once to Wilson himself) their inadequacy for meeting many of the problems with which industrial America confronted its government. Professor Link is indeed highly skilful in the way in which he shows how limited was the New Freedom's idea that tariff reform, a limited intervention in banking, and more 'trust-busting', were themselves sufficient to exhaust the progressive impetus that had helped to carry so fundamentally conservative a social and economic thinker as Wilson into power. (Wilson's adherence to the traditional dogmas of his party is shown in his acceptance of the 'spoils system' and his southern background in his toleration of further measures of race segregation in the government service.)

The story of the 'New Freedom's' legislative programme is thus the narrative core of the present volume in long chapters on 'tariff reform', 'the federal reserve act', and the anti-trust legislation. But this is ground that Professor Link has covered before, both in his textbook of twentieth-century American history *American Epoch* (not published in this country) and more recently in his volume in the new 'American Nation' series; here we are not allowed to forget that it is a biography we are reading, and that what primarily interests the writer is the light that these transactions cast upon Wilson as man and statesman.

The book therefore begins with some account of the physical and mental resources that Wilson brought to his great office and of the men he chose for his cabinet as well as of the indispensable *éminence grise*, Colonel House. From this account and from the discussion of subsequent episodes, particularly in the sphere of foreign policy, Professor Link enables one to get a picture of Wilson that goes far to explain the tragic conclusion of his career. Despite his academic origins, Wilson had by the time of his election long since ceased to take a serious interest in the development of the social sciences, or in the course of social and political development outside the sphere of American party conflicts—particularly was this true of all that concerned the world outside America. Indeed, Bryan, to whom, as Secretary of State, Professor Link is unusually kind, comes off better in this respect. So far from being the dogmatic intellectual of the stereotype, Wilson comes out as decidedly emotional rather than intellectual in his approach to politics, with morality (based upon sincerely held religious convictions) as his guide. Moral judgement on particular issues was something which Wilson arrived at out of his own inner consciousness and upon which he neither welcomed advice nor brooked contradiction. This conviction of his own righteousness helps to explain Wilson's occasional

indulgence in highly disingenuous sophistries. It also made him essentially a solitary—after the first year the Cabinet itself was thrust aside, apparently because of ‘leakages’. Professor Link suggests that Wilson’s well-known preference for feminine company arose from the fact that women were more likely to listen and sympathize and less prone to assert their own opinions on contested issues. To see disagreement as disloyalty was always a failing of Wilson’s.

These personal weaknesses were from the first most manifest in the sphere of foreign policy, where Wilson’s idea of the Presidential prerogative reached its apex; and they were fortified by his lack of trust of expert opinion, and in particular of the military. Although Wilson managed to liquidate ‘dollar-diplomacy’ in the Far East, his inability to do so in Central America was manifest, and sprang as Professor Link shows from an inability to relate his high principles to the facts of America’s dependence upon the Panamá Canal and the realities of political life in the region.

But the real object-lesson of the period dealt with is Wilson’s handling of the Mexican situation; and Professor Link’s treatment of the question is perhaps the best thing in the book. The question was doubly important because of its immediate effect upon Anglo-American relations; and Professor Link has been at pains to document the story from the British side as well, and has made use of private papers placed at his disposal by the present Viscount Cowdray, and by the late Lord Percy of Newcastle who was a member of the British Embassy staff at Washington at the time. Professor Link is too courteous to point out—as a reviewer need not be—that he was refused any access to the official British documents dealing with the affair, the usual ‘50-year rule’ being held to apply. It is to his credit that even so, his presentation of the British side of the matter is not seriously different from that given by Lord Grey in his *Twenty Five Years* in a passage he might have quoted with advantage. British historians can only envy the citizens of a country whose contemporary diplomatic history can be written from the wealth of archival material that Professor Link has at his disposal, and who are not hampered at every turn by departmental obscurantists, or by the collecting proclivities of a Lord Beaverbrook.

Compared with Professor Link’s cool appraisal of his hero, Professor Schlesinger’s first volume of his *Age of Roosevelt* plunges us back into party history in which there is no attempt made to conceal the author’s sympathies. After a prologue depicting Roosevelt’s inauguration in 1933, Professor Schlesinger takes us back briefly to the first great reform movement of the century, the ‘new Nationalism’ of Theodore Roosevelt, outlines the state of the nation, physical and moral, during the Harding-Coolidge era of normalcy, and goes on to a vivid picture of the impact of the Great Depression and of the failure of the nation’s leaders to respond to its challenge. On the other side we are given the story of the moves by which Roosevelt became the Democratic candi-

date for the election of 1932. His hero having secured the nomination, Professor Schlesinger goes back again to deal with his earlier years and political apprenticeship. The volume concludes with an account of the campaign itself and of the painful period between the election and the inauguration.

To handle the material in so complex a fashion demands very considerable literary skill, and this is indeed one of Professor Schlesinger's most obvious gifts. Even to those for whom much of the story is by now familiar ground from the biography of Roosevelt now appearing from the pen of Professor Schlesinger's colleague, Frank Friedel, or from the writings of such historians of ideas as Richard Hofstadter, the narrative itself will bring new excitements. Nor is this excitement achieved at the cost of fictionalization: the study is firmly grounded on the vast mass of printed and manuscript material for the period, and it is the skill of Professor Schlesinger in extracting the telling detail that gives the book its vividness.

The only criticism that can be made on general grounds is that Professor Schlesinger's own lack of interest in economics makes it hard for him to substantiate to the full his charges against Hoover and the Republicans. When they are attacked is it for their failure to handle the depression by the limited means which the orthodox economics of the day permitted or are they being condemned in the name of Keynesian theories developed in action at a later date but no more appealing at that time to Roosevelt than to Hoover himself?

The importance of this gap in Professor Schlesinger's powerful armament will not be tested in full until he comes to describe and analyse the 'New Deal' itself. If we have to take the 'New Deal' *en bloc* as Clemenceau insisted we must take the Revolution *en bloc*, it will be time to cry halt, at least for those uncommitted to either side in the American party struggle.



---

## HISTORY BOOKS FOR SCHOOLS: V

---

ELEANOR I. MURPHY

*Brighton Training College*

I IMAGINE THAT I AM NOT ALONE in having to stretch a meagre book allowance unbelievably far: and I never feel happy that I have spent it well. Am I to buy the scholarly book that my students ought to read or at least to know exists, in preference to the one that I can feel reasonably sure they will read? Possessing neither the erudition of my predecessors, nor the wit and urbanity of those Sunday reviewers who can persuade us to enjoy their reviews whether or not they persuade us to read the books, I have chosen the pedestrian path of deciding which of these books I should be glad to buy out of my book allowance. No one can say fairer than that.

First and foremost, I should put three anthologies. The two in *They Saw It Happen* series should be in every grammar and secondary modern school library, and they should be in the staff room libraries of junior schools, too, for many a story could be based on their extracts. The third anthology, a selection of passages from the works of great English historians, would be most useful in the library of the History sixth. Dr. W. O. Hassall's *They Saw It Happen, 55 B.C.-A.D. 1485*<sup>1</sup> is a delightful book: he has assembled a rich collection of contemporary accounts, many of them beautifully translated by himself. Some are old friends from *De Bello Gallico* or the *Domesday Book* or *Mathew Paris*: many are new, to me at any rate, such as the dialogues of Aelfric's pupils or the rules for behaviour from John Russell's *Book of Nurture*. The volume which completes the trilogy begun by C. R. N. Routh is T. Charles-Edwards and Brian Richardson's *They Saw It Happen, 1689-1897*.<sup>2</sup> Here, too, is a good balance between those contemporary sources which are well known but convenient to have gathered together, and rare finds such as the report of the Cup Final of 1882 taken from the *Blackburn Times*. There is a fairly heavy proportion of descriptions of battles in this volume, but perhaps not unjustly so, and there are some valuable accounts of domestic and social life. The extracts in both these collections are prefaced by a brief account of the source and by suggestions

<sup>1</sup> W. O. Hassall: *They Saw It Happen, 55 B.C.-A.D. 1485*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford. 1957. 236 pp. 15s.

<sup>2</sup> T. Charles-Edwards and Brian Richardson: *They Saw It Happen, 1689-1897*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford. 1958. 311 pp. 21s.

for further reading. The selection of *English Historians* made by Bertram Newman for the English Association<sup>3</sup> is designed to show the great historians as writers of literature. 'The purpose of literature is to give pleasure. The purpose of historical writing is to instruct. There is no reason why the two should not be combined,' writes Miss Wedgwood in her preface. The extracts range from the sixteenth-century Lord Berners' translation from the *Chronicles of Froissart* of the surrender of Calais to one from A. L. Rowse's *England of Elizabeth*. Powicke, Tawney, Namier—the giants of our own day—are here, but the value probably lies in the passages from some of those earlier historians whom pupils would not necessarily read today: historians of an age when moral judgements, unconfined by the labours of a monograph, could flow elegantly and magnificently. How well they wrote, the Lingards and the Leckys, the Gibbons and the Gardiners! If this book was to send our budding historians back to the classics of the past, not merely to Bacon and Clarendon, but to some of the historians of the last two centuries, it would be worth while. I foresee, however, another future for this selection: History teachers will be slipping quietly into the school library to use this as a quarry for examination questions for many years to come.

Next come two textbooks which have made a real attempt to provide up-to-date material. Suitable for English sixth forms is an American student textbook, *The Age of Power*, written by C. J. Friedrich of Yale and Charles Blitzer of Harvard.<sup>4</sup> This is one of a series with the praiseworthy aim of presenting student textbooks written by recognized scholars (the paper cover is presumably to keep the cost down for student pockets), though the plan 'to serve as the basic reading for one week of a semester course' comes somewhat strangely to English readers. There is no doubt, however, that this book does live up to its ideal. The authors take 'the new sense of Power' in Europe between 1610 and 1730 as the unifying theme. They therefore deal with the political thought, the philosophy and science, the art and architecture of the period before they treat of the Thirty Years War, the France of Louis XIV, the constitutional conflict in England, and, still more briefly, the rest of Europe. Within 190 pages, none of this can be treated in any detail, and this book would certainly not remove the need for further reading. It is too much of a commentary and synthesis to serve alone as a textbook, but it should be invaluable for the History sixth studying this period, providing a basis for discussion and comment when intelligently used. It is well written, showing the quality of two writers at ease in this period, with only a few American spellings to distract the English reader. The bibliography is sensible in its range. For O level pupils—and possibly not without its uses in the sixth form because of the

<sup>3</sup> Bertram Newman: *English Historians, selected passages*. Published for the English Association, O.U.P. 1957. 266 pp. School ed. 13s. 6d.

<sup>4</sup> C. J. Friedrich and Charles Blitzer: *The Age of Power*. Cornell University Press: O.U.P. 1957. 188 pp. 14s. (paper cover).

continuing gap in the Oxford series and the general run of available textbooks for this period—there is a new edition of the English history textbook by W. A. Barker, G. R. St. Aubyn and E. L. Ollard for the period 1688–1832.<sup>5</sup> This is a school textbook which makes a real effort to be abreast of modern scholarship. While there are, not unnaturally, some opinions I find myself in disagreement with, especially in the earlier part of the book—and a collective authorship has possibly helped to produce a certain pomposity of style and a tendency to dogmaticism—still, here is a textbook in which the chapters on social and economic conditions in the eighteenth century show the influence of Ashton and the political chapters have been affected by the work of Professor Namier and his school. If there is any fifth or lower sixth form master who is thinking of replacing his textbooks, then this is one well worth considering. Again, there is a sensible bibliography.

For the secondary modern schools, Norman Wymer's *Great Inventors* can be recommended.<sup>6</sup> He tells something of the work and lives of Watt, George Stephenson, Braille, Bessemer, Daimler, Edison, Marconi and the Wright brothers, with their inventions well illustrated by diagrams and photographs. These are far more valuable in their pamphlet form than when bound together. Their chief use would be for group work, and it is far better to have them available singly for a variety of topics, so that some could be used, say, for a topic on transport while Edison might come more readily into a topic on the history of lighting. The easy informal style in which they are written lends itself, too, more to the pamphlet than to the library book. For the junior school and for the lower forms of secondary modern schools, there is another in the invaluable *Bookshelf* series edited by Catherine Firth.<sup>7</sup> In this new *Museum Bookshelf*, A. F. Titterton has two booklets on prehistory, while K. M. Gadd is responsible for four on aspects of the history of Sumer and Babylonia, Egypt, Assyria and Greece: there is also a teacher's booklet. I have found the earlier booklets in the *History bookshelf* series so useful for group work in Junior schools, that I have no doubt that these new sets on the ancient world (two more are in preparation) will be equally helpful. They come at a time when almost every child is so interested in archæology that many teachers will welcome their assistance. Also suitable for this age range between the top of the Junior schools and the bottom of the Secondary Moderns, comes H. M. Madeley's *Reading and Writing*.<sup>8</sup> There are now a number of books available for this popular

<sup>5</sup> W. A. Barker, G. R. St. Aubyn, R. L. Ollard: *A General History of England, 1688–1832*. 2nd ed. A. and C. Black. 1957. 329 pp. 12s. 6d.

<sup>6</sup> Norman Wymer: *Lives of Great Men and Women*, series III, *Great Inventors*. 1, James Watt. 2, George Stephenson. 3, Louis Braille. 4, Sir Henry Bessemer. 5, Gottlieb Daimler. 6, Thomas Alva Edison. 7, Guglielmo Marconi. 8, The Wright Brothers. O.U.P. 1957. 32 pp. 1s. 9d. each. Library ed., 8s. 6d.

<sup>7</sup> C. B. Firth (ed.): *Museum Bookshelves*. 1, First shelf. A. F. Titterton: Men of the Stone Age, The Bronze and Early Iron Age. K. M. Gadd: Everyday life in Sumer and Babylonia, Work and play in Ancient Egypt, The warfare and hunting of Assyrian Kings, The artists of Greece. Ginn. 1957. 32 pp. each. 6 booklets, 6s., teacher's booklet, 6d.

<sup>8</sup> H. M. Madeley: *Reading and Writing*. Man's Heritage series. Longmans. 1957. 60 pp. 6s.



topic: this book is a pleasant and interesting addition to them and would make a good class reference book.

Somewhere in these books-to-buy suggestions I must include Christopher Lloyd's *Sir Francis Drake*.<sup>9</sup> Mr. Lloyd's immense store of knowledge about ships and shipping illuminates his very shrewd assessment of Drake and his achievements. This is a book which could be read with enjoyment and profit by a very wide age-range of pupils; it is well worth considering for almost every school library.

Betwixt and between comes a book which I cannot make up my mind whether to recommend—or not at all. I am not very fond of historical novels, but Ferdinand Lallemand's *The Cruise of the Dolphin*<sup>10</sup> is something out of the ordinary. Some of the amphoræ of a sunken Greek vessel outside Marseilles on which Commandant Cousteau's divers have been working bear a trademark which closely corresponds with the mosaics of an excavated house on Delos. The author has therefore made the plausible assumption that the merchant who owned the house at Delos, trading along the coast of the Mediterranean, met with the disaster which so impoverished his family that the house at Delos was never finished. The apparatus of scholarship is at times somewhat obtrusive, the general effect being rather like that of Becker's *Charicles*. But the liveliness and interest of the narrative should certainly stimulate in the minds of the young classicists and historians a genuine understanding of Greek social and maritime life, while the excellent photographs of the sunken vessel and of the house at Delos should make a great appeal to our archæologically minded pupils. At the same time, there is one reproduction of a Greek vase which should certainly have been omitted from a novel clearly intended for young people, and there are some references to the merchant's relations with the slave girl that could have been spared. Because of these, I hesitate to recommend this book without this warning: I would not know, quite honestly, whether to buy it or not.

Now for those books which I myself would not buy. I am sorry to have to include a Methuen Outline book in this category, for I have found many of this series so good as class reference books and for group work that I opened Audrey Cammiade's *Napoleon*<sup>11</sup> predisposed to like it. Presumably rising costs make this an unattractive book to look at: the paper and printing are poor, accents have been scattered with an uneven hand, and while the maps are good, the illustrations taken from Horace Vernet have not reproduced well. Miss Cammiade, in attempting to compress the life of Napoleon and to give us what the publishers describe as 'a sparkling narrative', has gone over the edge into a disagreeably racy style: I shudder to think of some of the essays which may be written from this book by those pupils with an unerring gift for

<sup>9</sup> Christopher Lloyd: *Sir Francis Drake*. Faber and Faber. 1957. 144 pp. 12s. 6d.

<sup>10</sup> Ferdinand Lallemand: *The Cruise of the Dolphin*, trans. Mervyn Savill. Methuen. 1957. 160 pp. 16s.

<sup>11</sup> Audrey Cammiade: *Napoleon*. Methuen's Outlines series. 1957. 84 pp. 10s. 6d.

picking out the wrong quotations. Nor do I feel that this biography is a happy departure for this series: it is not good enough for the pupils who are likely to be studying this period, and it is not suitable for those children with whom the topic books have been such a success. I should not consider, either, K. W. Walker's notebook summary of the *History of the British Commonwealth*:<sup>12</sup> a pupil should surely be capable of making his own notes.

In a rather different category come two books which are not without their virtues but which simply do not happen to appeal to me. *A Sketch-Map Economic History of Britain*, by J. L. Gayler, Irene Richards and J. A. Morris,<sup>13</sup> is meant for A level pupils, and, it is hoped, for students in technical schools and institutes. It is a competent series of maps and diagrams accompanied by brief notes, covering from the Roman occupation to the rise of the new textile industries in Britain in the twentieth century. I can only plead that I have an absolute blind spot on this type of work: maps and charts surrounded by information conveyed in boxes mean nothing to me. But we must all teach according to the grain of our own minds: I know many teachers—men, mostly—who teach quite happily and successfully in this way. This is their book: they must forgive me if it is not mine. For Junior school children there is R. K. and M. I. R. Polkinghorne's *In the Steps of the Apostles*.<sup>14</sup> This is written in a simple, naïve style, with each section followed by suggestions for 'self help' which, though often interesting, would keep the stationery cupboards depleted for years. The merit of this little book is that a good deal of the material in it is not usually found in similar books suitable for Junior school work: the stories range from St. Clement to Aggrey of Achimota. A copy in the staff room library could be of assistance to teachers looking for fresh stories for the R.I. period: it might also make a pleasant godparently present to an industrious godchild.

The power of television alone should serve to remind us as teachers of the importance of visual material. The uneven quality of most wall charts and film strips, however, shows how difficult it must be to prepare them. The pictorial charts of *Peace and War since 1066*<sup>15</sup> end with the H. bomb and the legend: 'Now mankind must renounce war in order to survive'. They might be useful for display purposes to set a school talking, or they could be used in a discussion group arguing on the campaign for nuclear disarmament. On the whole, however, I feel that by the time young people can discuss this problem of ours seriously, they would not need this type of material, though again this

<sup>12</sup> K. W. Walker: *History of the British Commonwealth. A notebook summary*. Harrap. 1957. 79 pp.

<sup>13</sup> J. L. Gayler, Irene Richards, J. A. Morris: *A Sketch-Map Economic History of Britain*. Harrap. 1957. 214 pp. 12s. 6d.

<sup>14</sup> R. K. and M. I. R. Polkinghorne: *In the Steps of the Apostles*. University of London Press. 1957. 174 pp. 5s. 6d.

<sup>15</sup> *Peace and War since 1066*. Pictorial Charts Unit, 153 Uxbridge Road, W.7. 2 sheets. 6s. each.

may only be my own prejudice. Of the two filmstrips received, *Life in Ancient Palestine*<sup>16</sup> is by far the better one. It has some good frames which it would be convenient to have together in this form, but there are also others which are ineffective or inaccurate. The accompanying pamphlet needs careful handling, and in the opinion of my Divinity colleague, might even be disastrous in the hands of those ignorant of the background. As for *Mediaeval Life: The Knight*<sup>17</sup>—no.

<sup>16</sup> Common Ground: *Life in Ancient Palestine*, colour, 27 frames, notes by Marie Neurath. 27s. 6d.

<sup>17</sup> Common Ground: *The Knight*, colour, 27 frames, notes by G. E. Pallant Sidaway. 27s. 6d.



---

## REVIEWS AND SHORT NOTICES

---

### ANCIENT

THE TESTIMONY OF THE SPADE. By Geoffrey Bibby. London: Collins. 1957. 448 pp. 30s.

Mr. Geoffrey Bibby, a British member of the staff of the Prehistoric Museum in Aarhus, has written an unusual book. He does not attempt to make any significant contribution to knowledge, and he does not even give a complete and balanced picture of 'Life in Northern Europe from 15000 B.C. to the time of the Vikings' (as the sub-title on the dust-cover claims), for his method is selective and, to take but one example, the Vikings are represented only by accounts of the discoveries of the ship-burials at Oseberg and Gokstad. It is somewhat surprising, therefore, that Mr. Bibby denies that his book is 'a popular archæology'. These comments are not criticisms, however, for the present reviewer admires Mr. Bibby's achievement unreservedly; he would urge that this is an outstandingly successful book and that, despite the author's modest disclaimers, it is a most effective as well as a most attractive introduction to archæology. It is, indeed, 'popular archæology' at its best, absorbing in its interest, full of zest, imaginative in approach, lucid in style and execution, and with none of the didactic 'you-are-a-beginner' attitude that mars so many well-intentioned attempts to convey archæological information to an audience outside the ranks of specialists.

A rough chronological division into four parts unfolds the changing scene clearly, even dramatically, perhaps the more so because the treatment is selective rather than comprehensive; but throughout the book the emphasis is on archæological discovery and on the gradual evolution of archæological method. Skara Brae, Stonehenge, Biskupin, kitchen middens, painted caves, the graves at Hallstadt, the golden horns of Gallehus and other famous sites and discoveries are ranged before us, with an abundance of excellent illustration, and they are woven into a picture which describes and explains the birth of typology, the use of pollen-analysis, the study of glacial varves, and the implications of radio-active-carbon. The picture is built upon short but sympathetic biographies of men like Christian Jürgensen Thomsen, J. J. A. Worsæ, Alfred Rust, General Pitt Rivers, Gordon Childe and Sir Mortimer Wheeler. As the author says, this is really a book about the men who have made archæology what it is today. It is probably this intimate personal approach, coupled with a fine sense of the dramatic, that makes the book so readable.

Mr. Bibby refrains from repeating the technical detail of learned papers, but his book is based upon much research and upon a command of the archæological material and sources. As far as the present reviewer can see, his story of human endeavour is set against an archæological background that is sound and scholarly. Even more impressive than the scholarship is

the author's skill in weaving a story as absorbing as a novel. He says it was 'a fascinating book to write'. It is certainly a fascinating book to read, and it ought to be within the reach of all those who are or may be interested in archæology. It ought to be in every school library, for example. Which is not to say that specialists themselves will not welcome a momentary respite from find-lists to ponder again on Alfred Rust's early struggles, Worsæ's triumphal processions, the tragic destruction of the golden horns of Gallehus, and the many other human incidents that surround every discovery and every advance in archæology.

*University of St. Andrews*

F. T. WAINWRIGHT

ROM UND RHODOS. By Hatto H. Schmitt. (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, Heft 40.) Munich: C. H. Beck'sche. 1957. xv + 223 pp. DM. 22.50.

The relationship of Rome and Rhodes is a matter of two particular problems and just over twenty years of baffling history. The first problem is whether Polybius gave 140 or 40 years as the period in which the two states co-operated before 167 B.C.; the second is why, with Pergamon, Rhodes appealed for Roman aid against Philip V of Macedon in 201 B.C. On the first Dr. Schmitt, like the most skilful of picture-cleaners, removes the whole of the overpainting of Holleaux's ingenious and entirely false logic and reveals '140' in the Polybian original. He is certainly right, even if we still have to wait for an inscription that will prove it. The second problem worries him less—and rightly—than it worries some of the moderns. After which, the baffling twenty years of history: the generous award of Lycia and Caria south of the Maeander to Rhodes in 188 for her services in the war against Antiochus III, the severe Roman 'note' eleven years later on the difference between trusteeship and exploitation of dependent areas, and ten years later still, after her forlorn and ill-timed attempt at mediation in the third Macedonian war, the vindictive elimination of Rhodes by the new world power of Rome. In the power politics of the Hellenistic world the stakes had never been so great as to prevent this small independent republic, with her trading influence and skill, from playing an important part; now Rome was predominant, and those days were at an end.

This is a good subject which, under Prof. Bengtson, Dr. Schmitt chose for his doctoral research. His treatment of it, admirable in its scholarly examination of the sources and of the various particular questions involved, is remarkable for the sympathy and imagination with which he makes the development of the crisis and the inevitability of its tragic conclusion entirely intelligible both from the Roman and from the Rhodian sides. This is no small achievement.

*Exeter College, Oxford*

J. P. V. D. BALSDON

Sir William Tarn's bold and brilliant study of the Greeks in Bactria and India appeared in 1938, with a revised edition in 1951. From it we learnt to think of a fifth Hellenistic dynasty 'vastly more important than the Attalids', both in the extent of their rule and in what they tried to do. Now an Indian Scholar, Dr. A. K. Narain, has produced a counterblast, *THE INDO-GREEKS* (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1957. xvi + 201 pp. 42s.), in which he argues that the story of the Indo-Greeks is part of the history of

India, but not of the Hellenistic world; 'they came, they saw, but India conquered'. The author is an expert numismatist, and well versed in the sources, both Greek and oriental; and he has good judgement. If nothing like so exciting as Tarn's book ('to write this book impersonally was not possible', Tarn wrote in his preface), his work is a sober and scholarly study of a complicated subject, in which the splendid Bactrian and Indian coins play a predominant part. On the whole, Dr. Narain probably underestimates the Hellenism of the eastern dynasties. Perhaps his least satisfactory chapter is the introduction, in which he advances the thesis that the Bactrian Greeks were the descendants of earlier settlers from the period before Alexander, and already hybrid Greco-Iranians in their social and political life; this can only be sustained by giving weight to some of the most dubious stories in the Alexander tradition. But when he comes to write on the Euthydemids, Eucratides, and Menander (in his view, virtually a Buddhist), his account deserves very serious attention. Many of Tarn's most attractive speculations sustain shattering blows. There is no space here for detailed discussion, but one may note the contraction in Demetrius I, who according to Dr. Narain, never crossed the Hindu Kush; the increased importance, in consequence, of Antimachus Theos, now the first of the Yavana to penetrate India; and the rejection of Tarn's theories linking the eastern dynasties with the Seleucids, including those based on the supposed 'pedigree' coins of Agathocles. A comparison between the genealogical tables in Tarn and Narain brings out the radical rewriting of the whole of the detailed history of the Bactro-Indian dynasties, and a reader who is not himself expert in the specialized field of Indian and Bactrian Greek coins may well be left bewildered, especially in the later period, when the duplication of rulers and the absence of literary sources rarely let the historian get beyond hypotheses. In a book written so very obviously within the shadow of Tarn's masterpiece a critical note was perhaps inevitable; and here and there Dr. Narain perhaps does less than justice to his great predecessor. But in the long run his more sober judgement of the Greco-Bactrian achievement, set against the background of the collapse of the Mauryas, will prove salutary for historians of the Hellenistic world. This is an important book and brings great credit to its Indian author.

*University of Liverpool*

F. W. WALBANK

## MEDIEVAL

THE BYZANTINE WORLD. By J. M. Hussey. London: Hutchinson's University Library. 1957. 191 pp. 10s. 6d.

Professor Hussey has followed her fine translation of G. Ostrogorsky's *Geschichte des Byzantinischen Staates* by a short survey of the whole field of Byzantine history and culture on her own account. Beginning with an historical summary she has most skilfully contrived within 75 pages to convey a feeling of unifying purpose in her treatment of policy from 324 to 1453, providing in the course of it the best short evaluation of the Palæologi available in English. It is good to see her stout defence of the Emperor Maurice and to find the less glamorous Amorians grouped with the Macedonian dynasty as 'sharing the same problems and activities'. The cocksure Michael Cerularius, the morbid Heraclius transmitting his troubles to his dynasty, the able long-reigning Comneni all facing the Sicilian foe, and the sixty-five-year-



old Andronicus I wedded to a French widow of thirteen are only some of the personalities that enliven a narrative often illustrated from contemporary sources. The treatment of feudalism and the long development leading to 1204 as major themes, lends a new and interesting perspective to events even in so short an outline.

More than half the book is devoted to selected topics and Professor Hussey's personal enthusiasm and research naturally has given particular distinction to chapters on 'The Monastic World', 'Church and State', and 'The Orthodox Church'. There seems less sympathy in 'Byzantine Art', and in 'Learning and Literature' the author's own scholarship may have stood in the way of a satisfactory synthesis—if one is possible. More explanation of Hesychasm might have been given since its importance as 'the living wood of Byzantium' is heavily stressed, nor would all agree that the Nerezi frescoes are 'the full flowering of Byzantine art' without more reasons. The name Skirkur for Nur-ed-Din's general is not Turkish, Arabic or common form, and it is disquieting to find 740 given twice in the text for the death of Leo III: this last is corrected in an appendix where, however, Romanus IV's accession is a few months out. A reference to 'the mosaic of Christ the All Powerful in the cupola of the monastic church of St. Luke in Phocis' seems a conflation of two mosaic masterpieces representing the Pantocrator in the dome at Daphni and in the narthex at St. Luke's.

These are small points to pick out of an excellent book in which a scholar has sought to make awkward material intelligible without over-simplification. The result is individual and stimulating, and many Byzantinists, besides the wider public for whom the book was written, will be grateful for its guidance.

*St. Paul's School*

P. D. WHITTING

A HISTORY OF MEDIEVAL EUROPE. By R. H. C. Davis. London: Longmans. 1957. 421 pp. 25s.

In the past few years half-a-dozen surveys of English or European medieval history have appeared, and publishers seem to have no reluctance to add to their number. Most of the previous books have been written by professors *emeriti* or teachers of long experience, who have given a pondered account that is the result of a lifetime's reflection. Mr. Davis is indeed far from being immature, but the circumstances of our time delayed his entry into academic life, and his book is not that of one looking back over a panorama of lectures but of one entering with his pupils (or readers) a world where new things are to be discovered and understood. If he lacks in consequence the catholicity and ordered progress of Previté-Orton or the ripeness of judgement with which Miss Deanesly brought forward things new and old, he has a certain adventurous freshness, a personal approach to old topics that his predecessors lacked. Though his survey will never be the indispensable book of reference, it is probably the best 'buy' among recent works for one who comes to medieval history for the first time.

The book took its rise from a course of lectures directed at 'modernists' herded, one gathers, like Jews to the sermon on Holy Cross day. The approach is therefore by way of a limited number of important topics, and the necessity to sell his wares demanded of the lecturer clarity and crispness. As a result, the barbarian invasions, the rise of feudalism, the Saxon empire,

Barbarossa, and the French monarchy are approached as by one who hopes himself to understand and to communicate his understanding, and there is a welcome absence of the detailed narrative of insignificant political events that still forms the bulk of so much historical writing. Not that the result is superficial: the reader will often find himself faced with long excerpts from original and little-known documents, and will be grateful for them. On the other hand, not a little that is important fails to get in. Even if union rules forbid any mention of England in 'European' history, a sketch of medieval Europe which contains no mention of Bede the Venerable or the Irish scholars and monks has its gaps, and the full and vivid account of the Franciscans is paid for by the virtual omission of the early Dominicans.

Careless judgements and slips are rare. One may wonder what 'all the genuine marks of inspiration' are that 'most modern scholars' see in Mohammed; the 'sequence' on p. 240 was surely not a *melisma* but the *Victimae paschali*; even M. Lefèvre would allow that the *Carta Caritatis* was complete in all essentials before 'the last quarter of the twelfth century'; Cîteaux was visited by the four elder daughters all together, not in turn; and the new site of Clairvaux was only a few hundred yards from the old, and scarcely on 'richer' land. Moreover, while Mr. Davis endeavours to keep abreast with the work of the critics on the early Cistercian documents, he takes no notice of the older and still more fiercely debated issue of the origins of the rule of St. Benedict. Finally, who are to be the beneficiaries of the brief lists of books 'for further reading'? Would any but specialists and accomplished linguists derive benefit from Sackur's *Die Cluniacenser* or a single complicated article of M. Lefèvre? Or from the three German books listed on p. 231, or the two French ones on p. 390?

These, however, are all minor points which do not affect the worth of the book. May we in conclusion ask for an arbiter to decide for us the gradient of the Middle Ages? For Mr. Davis 'the High Middle Ages' run from 900 to 1250. For most French and many German scholars the Merovingian and Carolingian periods are the high ones, while for some English writers the twelfth century alone is high. Are we thinking of the headwaters of a river or the height of summer?

Peterhouse, Cambridge

M. D. KNOWLES

CATHEDRAL AND CRUSADE. STUDIES OF THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH, 1050-1350. By H. Daniel-Rops: translated by John Warrington. London: J. M. Dent. 1957. x + 644 pp. 42s.

This volume is the third in M. Daniel-Rops' *Histoire de l'église de Christ*, and the first to be published in an English translation. It is the work of a distinguished 'homme de lettres', rather than a professional historian: one who has written novels, and whose *Jésus en Son Temps*, published in 1945, attracted attention. He here writes with enthusiasm of the springtide of Christian civilization and the Catholic church, and enthusiasm is always attractive: but what he writes in this volume is not balanced history. We have here a very different kettle of fish from, say, Fliche et Martin's *Histoire de l'Eglise*, and the difference is not merely in scale, but in objectivity.

First, as to the good points of this book: the sketch maps are good, their subjects unusually chosen (the roads to Compostella, Christian expansion on the Baltic, etc.). Medievalists will have no quarrel with the author's objec-

tion to the term 'middle ages' as denigratory, implying an unimportant stretch of time between two great periods: they too see the 'middle ages' as a great constructive period, when Europe (and to M. Daniel-Rops, this means western Europe) was the home of a great, Christian, international society, its ideals expressed by the Catholic church. They admire with him its art, its international political thought, its respect for the individual and compassion for the unfortunate. Then again, M. Daniel-Rops has allowed himself space to present attractively subjects often passed over briefly in single volume church histories: the pilgrimages to Jerusalem, Rome and Compostella: St. Bernard and monasticism: the *trêve de Dieu*: scholasticism, Aquinas and Bonaventura: cathedrals and crusades. He has a lively description of Christian missions in Asia and Africa, and even the gloomy chapter on what he calls 'the end of Christendom' is illuminated by the thought and word-pictures of Dante.

But, apart from the fact that most people will find too much *couleur de rose* in M. Daniel-Rops' general picture, they will certainly notice very many errors in detail, and not merely the unfortunate choice of words for translation ('reserve' for demesne, 'immunity' in a 'juridical' sense, etc.), or mere slips (as where 'the Protestant historian' of St. Francis is called Paul Labatier). The age of St. Louis is said to be that when glass was first used for windows (but what about Bede's description of Benedict Biscop's glass windows at Jarrow?) and also when horse-shoes were first used, which will astonish the military historians. English historians will be equally astonished to hear that the 'Exchequer Rolls' enable us to know that the population of England in 1086 was 1,100,000. The 'rise in the birth rate' is surprisingly said to have forced the 'teeming masses' to find living room in northern Spain and thus help on the Reconquista: and to have provided the 'vast manpower' which built the cathedrals and spread monasticism. Baptism, as authorized by the Latin church, was by 'a threefold infusion of water'! 'Feudalism' is surprisingly analysed without any reference to the shortage of coined money, the illiterate masses said to have been completely familiar with Christ in the 'written word', and the parish priest, among his many activities, to have 'kept the register of baptisms, marriages and deaths'. The chapter on 'The decline of schismatic Byzantium' shows no knowledge of even fairly modern Byzantinist studies, and the treatment of the fourth Crusade and its effect on all subsequent relations of the Greek and Latin churches is completely inadequate.

More fundamental than these and similar defects is M. Daniel-Rops' naïve explanation of what he regards as the rise and decline of Christian Europe. The people in some centuries, one gathers, were good, as having faith; in others bad, as having less faith. He never seems to suspect that the proportion of good and bad people may have been the same in good centuries like the twelfth and thirteenth, and in bad ones, like the fourteenth. He speaks of the fourteenth century in particular as one of decline: it does not occur to him even as a hypothesis that the church was struggling as hard to meet new conditions in the fourteenth century as in the thirteenth. He writes of change, either for the better or worse, but never of the mechanics of change.

M. DEANESLY



THE HISTORY OF THE CRUSADES. Edited by K. M. Setton. Vol. I. THE FIRST HUNDRED YEARS. Ed. by M. W. Baldwin. University of Pennsylvania Press: Oxford University Press. 1956. xxvi + 694 pp. 96s.

This *History of the Crusades* under American editorship is planned to appear in five volumes. The enterprise is the fruit of the lively interest in this field across the Atlantic which scholars such as Munro and Lamonte did so much to stimulate. Under the general editorship of K. M. Setton the first volume has been edited by M. W. Baldwin with a team of fifteen scholars of whom eight are English. Though alive to other spheres of activity, notably the Iberian peninsula and the north-east German frontier, the *History* devotes most of its space to the eastern crusading movements.

Vol. I opens with a useful survey of western Europe on the eve of the Crusades by S. Painter. This is followed by a section on relations between Muslims and Christians before the First Crusade. In the Spanish and Italian chapters R. Lopez's fresh and vigorous account of the Normans stands out amongst work that is disjointed and uneven in quality. Politics and diplomacy seem to dominate the scene unduly, though a genuine religious element is somewhat belatedly introduced by S. Runciman's essay on early pilgrimages to Palestine. The western story then breaks off and the reader is plunged into the Muslim world and introduced to the Caliphate and the Arab states (H. A. R. Gibb), the Isma'ilites and the Assassins (B. Lewis), and the Turkish invasions and the Seljuks (C. Cahen). However overwhelmed they may be by a sea of unfamiliar names, non-orientalists will at least be grateful for such expert summaries. Particularly outstanding is C. Cahen's lucid contribution, built to some extent on unpublished material and supplying much of the essential framework for the crusades in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The East Mediterranean background is completed by P. Charanis' account of Byzantium in the eleventh century. He points out at length the various internal troubles of the Empire (to which the serious debasement of the currency should be added, with a reference to P. Grierson's work in the *Byz. Zeit.* 48, 1953).

The inception of the First Crusade and its progress to the capture of Jerusalem (1099), the incident of the ill-fated crusade of 1101, and the development of the Latin states to 1144 follow—covering fairly familiar ground. The reader is then brought back on his tracks, and in an excellent chapter by H. A. R. Gibb (Zengi and the Fall of Edessa) is taken by this distinguished orientalist into the Muslim world of Aleppo, Mosul and Damascus, as well as that of the Turcomans further east. Fortified with some appreciation of the various reasons why Aleppo was so vital a centre in the crusading struggle, we return to the Latin world to follow the Second Crusade to its disastrous close. Here V. G. Berry points out that the Second Crusade marks a transitional stage in the movement, in that it has a much more limited objective than the earlier 'general outpourings' towards the Holy Places, and is thus nearer in character to the Third and Fourth Crusades. The downfall of the West after the failure to recapture Edessa is sketched in four chapters in which East and West alternate. The sections by H. A. R. Gibb are particularly notable. He describes the work of Nur-ad-Din as champion of the Muslims both against the heretic without and the infidel within, emphasizing not only political and military aspects, but 'the moral unification of the Muslim forces'. He then deals with the rise of

Saladin (1169-89), again stressing the moral qualities which he considers were ultimately responsible for the final Muslim triumph.

The advantage of a composite enterprise of this kind is that it enables the student of the crusading movement to enjoy the views of experts in widely differing, but interdependent, fields of study. This particular volume gains enormously from the contributions of H. A. R. Gibb and C. Cahen. The weakness of the volume, as far as planning goes, is the neglect of Byzantine diplomacy in its own right. The chapter on the Byzantine Empire 1096-1204 should have come in this volume and not in Volume II, even at the expense of cutting down the excellent but lengthy account of internal developments in Byzantium in the eleventh century which can now easily be obtained elsewhere, either in P. Charanis' own works or in G. Ostrogorsky's *History of the Byzantine State*. Byzantium, no less than Zengi or Nur-ad-Din, was a vital element in the tangled diplomacy of the century. And where are the Armenians, who surely deserve a section of their own?

This *History* has appeared swiftly on the heels of Dr. Runciman's three volumes. The two enterprises are allies and not rivals. When all five volumes are published, the American work should contain studies on the administrative, military, institutional and cultural developments which lie for the most part outside Dr. Runciman's brilliant narrative. And in compensation for its lack of unity and on occasion repetition (as in the bibliographical notes), the first volume presents a stimulating clash of views. It gives an admirable all-over picture of the various factors in the Near and Middle East which inevitably determined the fate of the crusades and crusading principalities. It does in fact provide an indispensable tool for all who are concerned with medieval history.

*Royal Holloway College, London*

J. M. HUSSEY

THE BAYEUX TAPESTRY: A COMPREHENSIVE SURVEY. By Sir Frank Stenton (General Editor), Simone Bertrand, George Wingfield Digby, Charles H. Gibbs-Smith, Sir James Mann, John L. Nevison, F. Wormwald. London: Phaidon Press. 1957. 182 pp. 47s. 6d.

The Bayeux Tapestry is well-known as a work of art and one of the prime sources for the history of the Norman Conquest, and reproductions of it can be bought quite cheaply. Why then this new production? The answer is simple, though curiously enough it is not stated in this volume. All previous photographic reproductions have apparently been based on negatives made for the British Government in 1871. It was high time that we had a new and better set of photographs, so as to see what the 'tapestry' really looks like, and the Phaidon Press is to be congratulated on having met the need. Mr. Percy Hennell's photographs are superb. One can study the stitchwork in detail and almost feel the texture of the embroidery. The book is more than an 'objet de luxe'; it is a scientific record. But it is to be regretted that the scale of the reproductions is not stated. The standard size appears to be about 1 : 5 but the enlargements vary, some being about 1 : 2 and some larger still. Some readers may also regret that the restored parts are not described in greater detail. There is a most informative note by Mr. Hennell on p. 55, and it suggests that, given the opportunity, he could have told us more. It would be churlish to ask for too much, however, when what we have is a magnificent volume. The text has been written under the general editorship

of Sir Frank Stenton who has assembled a distinguished team of experts, and who has himself written the chapter on the historical background. Professor Wormald has written on the style and design, Mr. Wingfield Digby on the technique and production, Sir James Mann on the arms and armour, Mr. Nevinson on the costumes, and Simone Bertrand on the history of the tapestry since 1476. A commentary on the plates is given by Mr. Gibbs-Smith. Each contribution has its own particular interest, but it is to be noted that all the writers accept the view that the tapestry was made between 1066 and 1077 for Odo of Bayeux, possibly in Normandy but more probably in England (Professor Wormald tentatively suggests Canterbury and his argument is fascinating in its detail). But there is interest on every page of this book. It deserves to be in every school and college library, and it will fire the imagination of all students of history.

*Merton College, Oxford*

R. H. C. DAVIS

CURIA REGIS ROLLS, 9 TO 10 HENRY III, Vol. XII. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office. 1957. xv + 681 pp. £9 9s.

This book contains the surviving record of pleas heard in the Bench at Westminster from the beginning of the Hilary Term 1225 to the end of the Easter Term 1226, with the exception of one membrane relating to the Easter Term 1225 which was found too late for inclusion. In appearance the volume is formidable, roughly two inches across the spine, printed in such small type that correcting proofs must have been a hazardous business, and priced so high that few teachers of history, whether in schools or universities are likely to buy it for themselves. Nevertheless, like all its predecessors in this series, this book is a quarry from which the social and economic historian of the thirteenth century, no less than the historian of English law, must hew his indispensable materials. Only a few matters of general interest can be quoted here. Against one plaintiff it was objected that she had four sisters living in Normandy (1846). A reference to the sale of 'a hall, a kitchen, a cattle-shed, and a barn' indicates the essential features of a thirteenth-century country establishment (519). A man who accused three others of planning the king's death admitted that he himself had escaped more than once from gaol: 'for the fear which he had of the devil who appeared to him in the guise of a scabby black monk he extracted stones from the prison wall to defend himself from the same monk' (1055). Some of the cases here printed have been available in print since Maitland published *Bracton's Note Book* in 1887, but this rare book has for long been even dearer than the present volume. It is sometimes worth while to compare the rough and ready transcript of a case made by Bracton's clerk with the version of the same case produced by a modern scholar. There is, for example, no indication in the *Note Book*, case 1669, that the judges had any hesitation in refusing dower to Alice widow of James de Cardunville on the grounds that she had not been married in the face of the church and dowered at its door (705). The tenant was Hugh of Wells, bishop of Lincoln, whose attorney replied that Alice was James's mistress and that he married her on his death-bed. Alice said that it was true that she was married in James's house while he was sick so that he put the ring on her finger and afterwards he recovered and went about from place to place, and she said that the banns were called at three neighbouring churches for three Sundays before he married her. In the



*Note Book* text the judgement follows without any hint that the judges delayed to pronounce it. The present edition shows that each clerk making up his master's roll wrote *ad iudicium* in the margin and left a space to fill in the judgement later. In one of the surviving rolls the note was never cancelled nor the judgement entered. In the other two the judges' decision was inserted and *ad iudicium* is struck through. Can we not here see law in the making? Mr. C. A. F. Meekings has greatly added to the value of this series by his brief elucidation of the history of the rolls and their treatment by archivists of past generations.

*University of Reading*

DORIS M. STENTON

CALENDAR OF KENT FEET OF FINES TO THE END OF HENRY III'S REIGN.

Prepared by Irene J. Churchill, R. Griffin and F. W. Hardman, with an Introduction by F. W. Jessup. Kent Archæological Society Records Branch. 1957. cxxxvi + 486 pp. £4.

Abstracts of all Kentish final concords levied before 1273 have been appearing serially for many years and the Records Branch of the Kent Archæological Society is to be congratulated on having now completed the task. The abstracts are full and careful and the introduction of over 100 pages tells the reader, as all good introductions should, why the ensuing documents were made, and what they achieved; and it adds much information about their subject matter. The introduction indeed is a work of true scholarship, in which its author, Mr. F. W. Jessup, avails himself of the best recent work in this field and adds contributions of his own. Thus he draws attention to the frequency with which in the thirteenth century feoffments were unsupported by a fine and shows conversely that charters vouched to warrant in fines are not often to be found. He analyses for his period the effect of the different settlements reached, showing that roughly a third were straightforward conveyances, and a third joint conveyances by husband and wife; the residue were put to miscellaneous uses. The study of the forms of fines has been carried a stage beyond the point hitherto reached; whereas in the later thirteenth and earlier fourteenth centuries some eight types can be distinguished, in Mr. Jessup's period there are over thirty. From a study of the rents expressed in fines Mr. Jessup concludes that a growing proportion of fines in Henry III's reign really recorded outright sales. Mr. Jessup attributes the decline in the practice of levying fines before itinerant justices to the Statute of Carlisle, but is it not perhaps more probably due to the decline in the eyre itself?

*Institute of Historical Research, London*

R. B. PUGH

CARTULARY OF THE PRIORY OF ST. GREGORY, CANTERBURY (Camden 3rd Series, lxxxviii). Edited by Audrey M. Woodcock. London: Royal Historical Society. 1956. xxi + 209 pp.

The basic arrangement of this cartulary is: charters by archbishops of Canterbury and the cathedral priory—in first place because St. Gregory's, founded by Lanfranc, was under archiepiscopal patronage; papal bulls; charters relating to churches and tithes; charters relating to lands and rents. Royal charters were omitted. Charters connected with the conveyance of land and rent to the priory occupy most of the cartulary. The great majority date from the first quarter of the thirteenth century; of these a high proportion

are explicit about the material consideration given. The number and capital cost of the canons' acquisitions during this period are impressive for such a modest estate. This activity, which may have slackened in the next quarter-century, was probably without precedent in degree, though the survival of record of five purchases from Stephen's reign is a warning against hasty assumption. The number of transactions immediately after the Interdict is noteworthy. Miscellaneous things of more than local interest abound: for example, the conveyancing deeds are unusually loquacious about the courts in which the acts were 'recorded'; there are several redemptions from Jews; the foundation charter bears on the date of *Domesday Monachorum*; in two instances rents are made enforceable by ecclesiastical sanctions.

A serious exception to the competence of the editorial work is the misunderstanding of two property transactions, on which important inferences are based (pp. xvii-xviii). The discussion of the manuscript somewhat obscures the fact that the original arrangement was upset by scribes 'B' and 'C'. The mysterious 'aele' (p. 142) should perhaps be 'aula'.

*Keble College, Oxford*

ERIC STONE

Recent historians have drawn heavily upon that life of Edward II which was once attributed mistakenly to an unknown monk of Malmesbury, yet this has long been relatively inaccessible amongst the volumes of the Rolls Series (*Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and II*, vol. ii, 1883, ed. Stubbs). This indispensable narrative is now again made readily available in N. Denholm-Young's *VITA EDWARDI SECUNDI* (Edinburgh: Nelson's Medieval Texts. 1957. xxvii + 150 pp. 25s.). Here, on the pattern of this admirable series, a clear and readable free translation on the right-hand page faces a Latin text opposite; thus all tastes are served. Dr. Denholm-Young has already discussed the authorship of this 'memoir' (*English Historical Review*, lxxi, 1956); he attributes it to Mr. John Walwayn, D.C.L., a household servant of the earl of Hereford, sometime a canon of Hereford, a treasurer of England, an escheator, and apparently a member of the middle-party. The author is learned, perspicacious, and something of a moralizer; above all he is a west-country man, who was much concerned with events and personalities in the south-western marches of Wales; no other chronicler gives so much attention to 'the great insurrection' of Bristol. Throughout the writer lays great emphasis on baronial power as an essential ingredient of government and thus gets to the root of the conflicts of the age, though he has no interest in administrative or constitutional development as such. Some pages are missing for the crucial months after Boroughbridge and the story unfortunately ends in 1325 before the dramatic climax of the reign. We are indebted to the editor for this excellent edition, with its lucid, if brief, introduction and notes, and its perhaps rather over-selective index.

*University of Bristol*

MARGARET SHARP

STUDIES ON THE POPULATION OF MEDIEVAL LONDON. By E. Ekwall.

Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell. 1956. pp. lxxi + 334 pp. 30 kr.

London is indebted once again for the publication of basic material for its history to Lund University, with the aid of the Humanistiska Fonden, and to the diligent collation and analysis of Dr. Ekwall. The author's main interest is linguistic—the rise of standard English. He has attempted to sup-

plement the few early texts in the English language by a study of the development of London place and personal names found in Latin manuscripts. He, and others before him, have asserted that in the medieval period London language changed in dialect from Saxon to Anglian—from a Southern to a Midland dialect. Dr. Ekwall sets out to prove that this change resulted from the increase in trade, particularly in wool and cloth, between London and the Midlands, bringing with it increased immigration from the Midlands to London. He also suggests that Midland immigrants produced the upper classes in London, for written words were of course the language of the upper stratum of the population. His theories are of course based on a sample. In such records as are available to him he has identified, during a century ending in 1350, some 2750 immigrants from the Midlands in London, and in the previous century about 150. His figures in no way suggest total immigration—an average of under 30 a year could prove nothing—but can indicate a proportion as between the Midlands, Home Counties and the rest of the country. From 1250 onwards Southern England no longer predominated in refreshing London's population, it was equalled by the Midlands. The effect on language of this Midland influx and trade contacts only the specialist can estimate. The text of 300 pages lists the Midlands immigrants under counties, with references indicating occupation, status and families. The introduction is concerned partly with linguistic matters and partly with the significance and distribution of country surnames found in London. This book is a branch of a tree which in due time may bear its coveted fruit.

P. E. JONES

THE ESTATES OF THE HIGHER NOBILITY IN XIV CENTURY ENGLAND. By

G. A. Holmes. Cambridge University Press. 1957. xiv + 180 pp. 22s. 6d. The great magnates of fourteenth-century England were a group of no more than twenty earls and dukes, distinguished from the lesser barons by the extent of their landed possessions. Incomes varied considerably and John of Gaunt (with over £12,000 a year) was about eight times as wealthy as one of the poorer earls, the earl of Devon. Individually the magnates were 'outstanding enough to be independent political powers' and Dr. Holmes has no doubt that 'they ruled the England of their day'.

During the fourteenth century the great nobles became more powerful. They added to their estates at the expense of both the lesser landowners and of the crown. Royal favour was the most potent factor in the making and the survival of magnate inheritances, as the vicissitudes of the Mortimer earls of March and the Montague earls of Salisbury illustrate so well. The power of the lords was further strengthened because the crown now exercised less rigorously its feudal rights: many lords died leaving heirs who were minors, but royal wardship of a considerable part of their lands was often avoided by legal devices, such as enfeoffment to use and the creation of jointure. Estates kept out of the king's hands during the heir's minority were administered in accordance with the will of the deceased lord. By tracing these developments in Edward III's reign and discussing the work of baronial councils in the administration of great estates, Dr. Holmes has made a notable contribution to the history of the English nobility in the later middle ages. But it should be stressed that such evasion of the Crown's feudal rights



was generally made possible by royal licence and through the king's indulgence towards favoured subjects. Jointure and enfeoffment to use could be employed to protect all the lands of a baronial family against royal wardship: Dr. Holmes states (p. 57) that apparently no attempt was made to treat the *whole* of a great inheritance in this way, although (pp. 50-1) he shows Richard, Earl of Arundel (d. 1376), doing that in respect of all the estates of his two earldoms.

After 1350, the position of the great magnates was seriously threatened by economic changes. Although the worst effects of the Black Death on manorial profits were short-lived and 'income in the 1370's is generally not 10 per cent lower than it had been in the 1340's', between 1370 and 1390 the great landowner's efforts to maintain his revenues were visibly failing and 'the tide turned severely against him'. Were the English barons facing serious financial difficulties at the end of the fourteenth century? if so, a clearer statement is needed. And was land 'no longer a good object of deliberate investment'? Despite its title, this study is fortunately not limited to England, and the economic development of the Welsh marcher lordships of Usk and Denbigh is considered at length.<sup>1</sup>

In dealing with the revenues of the marcher lords, no mention is made of 'mises', which were a valuable source of casual income. 'Mises' (or 'the tallage of recognition') were paid to marcher lords, as successors to the Welsh princes, on their first entry into the lordship, and considerable sums were rendered over a term of years (on Henry VIII's accession, 'mises' amounted to 600 marks in the lordship of Denbigh and 500 marks in the lordships of Usk, Caerleon and Trellech). The nature of 'donum' (as paid to the dowager-countess of March as lady of Denbigh in 1373) might have been investigated and (p. 100) the fine imposed in the lordship of Denbigh in 1362 was £400 (payable in four years), not £4000 (and that fine was not levied on the whole lordship, but on four of the six commotes). At the beginning of the fifteenth century baronial incomes in Wales were drastically reduced by Glyn Dŵr's rebellion and in the lordship of Denbigh, in 1426, revenues were 'in general about a half to two-thirds of their normal fourteenth-century value'. Dr. Holmes comments 'Whether the effects of so great an upheaval were gradually overcome we cannot tell'. More may yet be known: materials exist and the *valor* of the lands of Duke Richard of York for 1442-3 (which includes the lordships of Denbigh, Usk and Caerleon. Public Record Office. S.C. 11/818) might profitably have been compared with the survey of the lordship of Denbigh of 1334 and the *valors* of the Clare lands in Wales early in Edward III's reign.

It is regrettable that this important book is unduly condensed. Often further information would have been welcome (e.g. if the Crown exercised so little control over movements of magnate property, why was William de Ufford, earl of Suffolk (d. 1382) unsuccessful in his attempt to leave his estates to his nephew?). A few errors were inevitable in so detailed a work. Robert de Montalt (p. 7) sold not his lands but their *reversion* to Queen Isabel. Lands held in wardship during a minority do not *escheat* (pp. 29, 31, 94). Some dates of death can be amended; Henry of Grosmont, duke of Lancaster, died in 1361, not 1360: Richard, earl of Arundel, in 1376, not

<sup>1</sup> In the map on p. 102, the lordships of Caerleon and Trellech are merged in the lordship of Usk.

1375: Mary of St. Pol, Countess of Pembroke, died in 1377, not 1371, and moreover she was not among the dowagers who were heiresses to English estates. The legacies bequeathed by Hugh, earl of Stafford (d. 1386), to Sir Roger Sygelhem (not Sygelbourn), knight, and Goselin Deyville were not annuities and (also on p. 64) the annual fee payable to Sir Nicholas de Stafford is stated to have been both 40 marks and £20: the former is correct. In Odcombe manor, co. Somerset (see p. 108) in 1379 (not 1378), William Westhouse paid an entry fine of £40 to the earl of Pembroke and Lord Zouche (not to the earl of March) for most (but not all) of the lands lately held by Joan (and not John) Wodehouse. Lands in bond tenure were held by Joan Wodehouse, but was she a villein? There is no mystery about her departure from Odcombe and no protest about that (p. 109) was made by the earl of March's council. It is difficult to see where such a protest could have been addressed: Joan Wodehouse had died.

*University of Southampton*

T. B. PUGH

THE MERCHANT OF PRATO. By Iris Origo. London: Cape. 1957. 380 pp. 35s. Partly because of legitimate pride in his career, and partly no doubt because he was a born hoarder, Francesco Datini, a Tuscan merchant of the late fourteenth century, kept with unusual and scrupulous care the records of his business and private affairs, and left instructions in his will that the resultant accumulation of papers should be preserved in his own house at Prato. The collection, which has survived the centuries and even come unharmed through the Second World War, is of enormous bulk: it runs to some 150,000 letters, over 500 account books and ledgers, 300 deeds of partnership, 400 insurance policies and some thousands of bills of lading, letters of advice, bills of exchange and cheques.

The archives are well organized and their contents have been adequately exploited by Italian economic historians, who long ago recognized the value of these papers for the history of medieval commerce. The Marchesa Origo by no means neglects Datini's business career, devoting perhaps a third of her book to it, with a chapter on the cloth-trade that is especially interesting. But her main preoccupation is with the personalities of the merchant himself, of his wife Margherita, and of his friend the notary Ser Lapo Mazzei, and with the colourful background of fourteenth-century Italy against which their lives were set. She places at the head of her introductory chapter Marc Bloch's 'L'historien ressemble à l'ogre de la fable. Là où il flaire la chair humaine, il sait que là est son gibier'; and if this is her text, she practises what she preaches. The technique, after all, is not so different from that which she used so attractively in her own bit of personal history, *War in Val d'Orcia*, and those who remember the deftness with which she handled character and event in that book will not be surprised at the understanding portrayal of both individuals and an age that emerges from the present volume. Much of the attraction of this kind of work lies in its detail, and in this connection the author shows a notable mastery of her archive material. Especially valuable is what she has to say about the recrudescence of domestic slavery in Tuscany after the Black Death.

One or two minor criticisms may be made. The Marchesa Origo refers to the cumbersome repetitiveness of the letters that she has used, and she has not altogether escaped repetitiveness herself. She refers three times, for

instance, to Margherita's having to rise in the morning before the front-door of the house was opened. By way of illustration the volume has twenty-five plates: they are well chosen, but the titles on the plates themselves give no indication of provenance and, though this is to be found in a list at the front of the book, even here rather more detailed description would have been acceptable. Some of the reproductions in colour are not entirely successful. The index, by academic standards, is over-selective.

In general, however, the Marchesa Origo has contrived to preserve a balance between the needs of the general reader and those of the specialist. The notes, though unobtrusive, are useful, and there is a good bibliography.  
*New College, Oxford* H. E. BELL

The publication of another medieval register of the archbishops of Canterbury, the *REGISTRUM THOME BOURGCHIER CANTUARIENSIS ARCHIEPISCOPI, 1454-1486*, edited by F. R. H. Du Boulay (Oxford University Press, for the Canterbury and York Society. 1957. 2 vols. xlvii + 569 pp.), is to be warmly welcomed. This register is much slighter than those previously published, consisting of only 169 folios as compared with about 900 folios in Archbishop Chichele's register, which covers the roughly equal period from 1414 to 1443. It is obviously imperfect, and its make-up is less orderly than that of the earlier registers. Probably some of the quires were lost before binding, but Mr. Du Boulay thinks that a certain neglect at the time is also likely. In the section of miscellaneous letters and bulls the archbishop was to some extent responsible for what went in, and probably a primate who was more than once in his register declared to be too busy to attend to his routine ecclesiastical work, was also too busy to supervise the full keeping of his official diary. Thomas Bourghier owed his preferment largely to his aristocratic birth and to the influence of the court party (he was a bishop from the age of about twenty-three) and much of his time was occupied on the royal council. Here his ability was unquestioned, and Mr. Du Boulay suggests there is enough evidence to show that he was more than a clever time-server who survived political storms through easy political virtue. He appears in politics as an arbitrator and peacemaker and seems to have been regarded with genuine feelings of trust. His personality however remains in shadow, and the official and impersonal records before us can do little to illuminate it. The fullest surviving sections of his register are the institutions and ordinations, and Mr. Du Boulay has contributed a useful analysis of these in his introduction. The editing is scholarly and there is a full index of persons and places and a short index of subjects.

*King's College, Aberdeen*

KATHLEEN EDWARDS

## EARLY MODERN

CALENDAR OF INQUISITIONS POST MORTEM AND OTHER ANALOGOUS DOCUMENTS PRESERVED IN THE PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE. HENRY VII: Vol. III. London: H.M.S.O. 1955. 844 pp. 105s.

Publication of the *Calendar of Inquisitions* for the reign of Henry VII began in 1898 and was completed in 1955. The appearance of Vol. II (in 1915) raised hopes of a series of calendars of all the 'modern' inquisitions post mortem down to the ending of royal feudal wardship in the civil wars of



Charles I's reign. Such expectations remain disappointed: it is still intended ultimately to complete the medieval calendars of inquisitions to cover the period 1377 to 1485, but there are no plans for continuing these volumes beyond 1509.

After their removal to the Public Record Office, the Chancery inquisitions post mortem for Henry VII's reign were re-arranged into two categories, and those inquisitions taken in accordance with writs and commissions were separated from others (*virtute officii*), apparently made by the escheators on their own initiative. That classification explains the structure of this concluding volume, which completes the record of all inquisitions of Henry VII's reign. Most of the volume consists of inquisitions taken as directed by Chancery writs between 1505 and 1509: the rest of the inquisitions calendared (mainly *virtute officii*) cover the whole reign, and the gaps in the Chancery series are remedied somewhat by inquisitions post mortem from the Exchequer records (contained in Appendix I, pp. 458-586). Yet, even when all survivors are assembled, these returns remain very defective, particularly for the baronage.

No doubt genealogists and local historians will derive most benefit from this expensive production. Like its two predecessors, it contains in full many wills of the gentry of Early Tudor England and has much information concerning family settlements, jointures, marriage portions, annuities granted and, occasionally, directions as to the price to be paid for lands purchased or sold after the testator's death. Fortunately the values attributed in the inquisitions post mortem to the lands of the deceased tenant-in-chief are calendared (their omission from the corresponding medieval series necessitates frequent reference to the original files in the Public Record Office). No significant details are left out, except the *place* at which the inquisition was taken, and sometimes that is important: inquisitions post mortem were not always made in the vicinity of the estates described. In investigating concealments of the Crown's feudal rights, Henry VII's officials carried their enquiries back more than one generation; in 1506, inquisitions were taken (Nos. 43, 87, 1004, 1162) concerning the lands late of Sir Thomas Green, Kt., who had died early in Edward IV's reign. Lunatics are numerous in this volume and more than sixty inquisitions (chiefly not *post mortem*) relate to the property of fools and idiots, unfit to govern themselves or their lands: that indicates the activity of royal officers looking for property of which the custody belonged to the king, and not the decadence of the English land-owning classes after the Wars of the Roses.

*University of Southampton*

T. B. PUGH

THE THOUGHT AND CULTURE OF THE ENGLISH RENAISSANCE. An anthology of Tudor Prose, 1481-1555. Edited by Elizabeth M. Nugent. Cambridge University Press. 1956. xix + 703 pp. 37s. 6d.

THE ELIZABETHANS. Edited by Allardyce Nicoll. Cambridge University Press. 1957. viii + 174 pp. 25s.

Professor Nugent's collection makes an impressive book; or rather three books in one. Its framework is an anthology of early Tudor prose up to about the middle of the century, covering an immense range, with examples of humanist literature, contemporary political theory, the work of the grammarians and the medical writers, sermons, chronicles and romances. The net

has been flung wide and, it must be confessed, some of the smaller fish might well have been cast back into the sea. Others are too large to be digested with undiminished pleasure. But taken as a whole the wealth and diversity of the material is an education and a delight. Here are Colet's 'Statutes of Paul's School' which, in brief compass, covers so much, including a pensions scheme for retired schoolmasters; and, with other projects, we have extracts from Vives' plan for the education of women, as well as from the better known '*Governor*' by Sir Thomas Elyot. More's *Utopia* contributes something but so does FitzHerbert's *Book of Husbandry*. For medicine we have, amongst a number of fascinating extracts, *The Great Herbal* and *Roesslin* on childbirth. Tyndale's and Coverdale's bibles make their appearance and so does Erasmus's sermon on the Child Jesus. Hall's chronicle and Cavendish's life of Wolsey are represented and the collection ends with a romance: the adventures of 'Tyll Howleglass'. In so vast an anthology, a reviewer will naturally find passages which appear to yield little, while he looks in vain for his favourite friends. Grocyn's surviving writings are negligible and his will sheds no light whatsoever on Tudor humanism; but no room has been found for Polydore Vergil amongst the chronicles. Latimer's sermon on the card could well have yielded place to one of his court sermons, which give us a better picture of the man and his age. Dudley's *Tree of Commonwealth* was entitled to a little space in the section on political and social order. A preamble from a Reformation statute would have proved more rewarding than a good deal of the Tudor verbiage which plagues every student of the age. But an anthology is bound to be idiosyncratic, and to the regret at some omissions one must add the surprise and pleasure at little known pieces found throughout the volume.

The extracts comprise, of course, the principal part of the book but they are preceded in each section, first by a general introduction and then by brief biographies of the writers here represented. They are contributed by distinguished scholars of English literature and are sometimes, as in the case of Professor Douglas Bush's introduction on Tudor Humanists, witty and suggestive. On the other hand, Professor Campbell's interesting and thoughtful note on sermons and religious treatises starts off with the dogma that 'In Tudor England religious conviction was the determining power not only of ecclesiastical but also of political events', which would imply that a good many Tudor historians have laboured in vain. Nor does one know what to make of the extraordinary observation that 'Mary, like all the Tudors, lacked the wisdom necessary for true greatness'. An unfortunate misprint has antedated Gardiner's *De vera obedientia* by ten years; while Professor Zeeveld has confused the Western rising of 1549 with Ket's rebellion, a very different business altogether.

The biographies are most useful and comprise, in themselves, a miniature—and up to date—Dictionary of National Biography of considerable value. Tyndale has given a little trouble. On p. 188 his birthdate is given as '1494?' in the title and 'about 1492' a little lower down. Two conflicting versions are given of his execution, correctly on p. 189 and wrongly on p. 422. Yet these criticisms in detail cannot detract from the value of this well-planned and executed symposium. There is no comparable collection for the period in a single volume and it has fully earned a place in any private, public or school library worthy of the name.

Professor Allardyce Nicoll's *The Elizabethans* is at the same time more adventurous and more limited. His object is 'to allow the Elizabethans to give an image of their times' and he draws upon literature, the arts, architecture, science, medicine and other fields for his examples. The result is a handsome volume and a neat balance between poetry, prose and illustrations. But so bold an experiment carries hazards of its own. Literary sources alone, as is well known, convey a false impression of the enclosure movement; and the same is true of the law. So many extracts are included that some are useless snippets (e.g. 'Dost thou love hawking?'); while the decision to relegate to the back of the book even the titles of the pictures as well as all the other extremely helpful notes, is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the current trend. To cut extracts about without the conventional indications that this has been done is indefensible in a work of fine scholarship, and it is lamentable that so welcome and resourceful a book should be published without an index.

University College, London

JOEL HURSTFIELD

WHITGIFT AND THE ENGLISH CHURCH. By V. J. K. Brook. London: 'Teach Yourself History' Series, English Universities Press. 1957. 190 pp. 8s. 6d.

It comes as something of a surprise to find a volume on Whitgift included in this series. He was clearly no Lenin or Cromwell. Nor, to descend from those Olympian levels, was he a Wycliffe or a Cranmer. He was certainly concerned with an important theme in English history—the defeat of Elizabethan Puritanism. But neither the decisiveness of that defeat nor of Whitgift's part in it should be overemphasized. The Puritans were certainly not finally beaten, nor is it easy to believe that Elizabeth I could not have found another instrument to gain her ends had Whitgift not been at hand.

But this is, perhaps, ungrateful quibbling. For a good modern biography of Whitgift was much needed, and, within the limited compass allotted to him, Mr. Brook has provided one. He gives an admirable account of the less familiar aspects of Whitgift the scholar, the academic administrator, the energetic Master of Trinity (the real founder of whose greatness he was) as well as of his more celebrated activities as the opponent of Puritanism. The consistency of Whitgift in all his differing rôles is rightly stressed. A scholar of massive learning and a dogged controversialist, his true bent was nevertheless that of a realistic administrator who judged contemporary issues in terms of their practical consequences not of their theoretical justification. But he was not the unrelenting tyrant nor yet the compliant erastian of his enemies' tradition. He was fair-minded, unvindictive, and remarkably judicious in his choice of lieutenants; and his genuine zeal for reform, provided it was brought about within the framework of the church by law established, is clearly brought out.

Mr. Brook himself evinces many of the traits which make Whitgift so sympathetic a subject for him. He is sensible, scholarly, and moderate; suspicious of the 'detailed scrupulosity' of the Puritans and warmly appreciative of the virtues of Anglicanism. If he glosses over too lightly some of the less admirable of Whitgift's characteristics and methods, it should be remembered that the Archbishop got an undeservedly bad press in his own day and has usually had one since.

University College, Swansea

GLANMOR WILLIAMS



THE WEALTH OF FIVE NORTHAMPTONSHIRE FAMILIES, 1540-1640. By Mary E. Finch. Oxford: Northamptonshire Record Society. 1956. xx + 246 pp. 30s.

This is a pioneer work of high merit. Dr. Mary Finch has at last done what historians have been urging each other to do for a long time. She has gone into a county, dug deep into its materials and tested the various tenaciously-held theories as to the fortunes of the gentry. It is true that she is here concerned only with the upper segment of that class (the Ishams, Spencers, Treshams, Fitzwilliams and Brudenells), and that her conclusion is, in essence, that we can draw no all-embracing conclusion about the communities she has investigated. But even her negative findings are important.

For, if no universal cause made or marred all their fortunes, at least these families had each of them to face the universal and characteristic problems of the Tudor and Stuart agrarian economy: a shortage of long-term loans, a tenant system cluttered up with ancient tenures and time-honoured, time-wasting procedures; the heavy drain of younger sons whose combined requirements could easily outrun the income that the ancestral lands could yield; and the heavy and growing cost of dowries. The latter part of this period seems to have produced a buyer's market for brides, with the result that three marriageable daughters in one generation could almost ruin a family.

The holding of public office, Dr. Finch shows, did not in itself drain away the wealth of a statesman. She explodes the myth, put about by his son, that when Fitzwilliam, Elizabeth's Lord Deputy in Ireland, died his wealth had shrunk to 11s. 3d. On the other hand, the desire to continue to live like a great statesman, when the jobs had gone elsewhere, could indeed, as in the case of the Treshams, worsen a situation already made dangerous by the offer of £12,200 as marriage portions. What is clear, also, is that a landlord prospered if he could 'improve' his land by concentrating his possessions; go over to sheep—until the slump came; get rid of uneconomic leases and see that his rents kept pace with inflation and the mounting profits of his tenants. But that prosperity was itself dependent upon two chances of inheritance: a fertile business brain and a relatively infertile marriage—as in the case of the Ishams and the Brudenells. So endowed, the greater gentry could weather the sudden storms of bad harvests, recusancy fines and trade depressions.

All these, and other, problems are explored by Dr. Finch with a wealth of data and a clarity of exposition, save in a few passages where she assumes that her readers fully share her *expertise* in the devious ways of land entail. Her work is marked throughout by ingenuity, resourcefulness and integrity of scholarship; and it deserves to be read and pondered over. It only remains to add that Professor Habakkuk's preface should be required reading for students of the period.

*University College, London*

JOEL HURSTFIELD

THE ANCIENT CONSTITUTION AND THE FEUDAL LAW. By J. G. A. Pocock. Cambridge University Press. 1957. 262 pp. 30s.

This book is a very considerable achievement. It sets up a new stance for the historian of seventeenth-century English thought and constitutional development, and it gives a new meaning to that rather forbidding phrase

'the history of historiography'. Mr. Pocock establishes himself in his first book as a historian of remarkable learning, judgement and force.

He seems to have started at that level of pure description which has marked this new study up till now, and hindered its mature development. He wanted to find out how much people in the Stuart Age believed in the Norman Conquest as the beginning of English despotism, or in Magna Charta as the origin of English liberty. He was interested in the historical assumptions of Lord Chancellor Coke, of William Prynne, and particularly in the prolonged debate about English parliamentary development which went on during the Exclusion controversy of the 1680's, the history battled over by Petit and Brady, Tyrrell and Sidney, the history so nonchalantly flicked to one side by the olympian Locke.

But the extraordinary things he found out rapidly deepened his analysis and widened his historical field. Not only Coke, he discovered, but all the common-lawyers right through the century, and historical writers down to Dugdale and Petit, believed that the constitution they were so proud of was literally so old as to be without origins: 'immemorial' in the legal sense became eternal in the chronological sense. This doctrine of the ancient constitution was so formidable between 1640 and 1660 that it could take away men's lives: 'some men have perished by fragments and partial story (picked out of mouldy parchments and obscure authors which perhaps they never knew of)' as Robert Brady said to the Secretary of State in 1675.

For the immemorial constitution in Stuart England made up what we may now regard as the classic instance of a closed ideology. In Scotland and in France, our nearest neighbours and societies, whose intellectual experience we shared in every other field, men did not suffer from this strange astigmatism when they looked towards the past. The reason, and Mr. Pocock argues this point with a cogency and a skill which seem to defy criticism, was that in these countries men had begun to recognize the nature of feudal institutions. In England this discovery was late, partial and held back from having its effects by the prejudiced resistance of the common-law mind, as it is here called. The historical advance had been made in the 1620's by Sir Henry Spelman, and much of the text is a commentary on the delay in its impact. The unitary legal system in England, the prestige of the law and the lawyers, the intimate relationship between views of law and legal history and political realities combined to keep Englishmen wilfully ignorant of the past of their own society. The famous Anglo-Saxon historical sense turns out to be in its origin a passionate and interested devotion to a mythology, a total, not a partial obscurantism.

In the Exclusion Controversy, Brady nearly succeeded in breaking through this singular system of defence, but 1688 engulfed critical history once again. Mr. Pocock ends with a valuable chapter on 1688 in the history of historiography, and some interesting remarks on the eighteenth century. In the course of this book he suggests an approach to Harrington's 'economic determinism' which seems to me to devastate a great area of argument about this writer, so important to the current controversy about the rise of the gentry, and makes remarks of comparable incisiveness on this historical attitude of Thomas Hobbes. These are the incidental results of his having worked himself into a position so refreshingly novel.

This book, then, advances its subject and must excite and stimulate the

working historian. Its impact on the teacher and the student may, perhaps, be less important, for it is still history at one remove and Mr. Pocock seems determined to keep it so. For these reasons its occasional inaccuracies and its slight tendency to over-elaboration in argument matter very little. It is adequately, occasionally eloquently written, and if it raises many more questions than it can possibly solve this is what we must expect.

*Trinity College, Cambridge*

PETER LASLETT

THE ROYAL AFRICAN COMPANY. By K. G. Davies. London: Longmans. 1957. x + 390 pp. 42s.

Nearly half a century ago W. R. Scott attempted a full-scale account of the constitution and finance of English, Scottish, and Irish joint-stock companies. His attempt was premature; at that time adequate histories of the separate companies did not exist, and it was beyond the powers of one man to master fully the constitution and finance of so many companies. There was need rather for separate and detailed histories of the individual companies, which could later be synthesized into a general study of joint-stock organization. Some of these separate histories have appeared since Scott wrote, and Mr. Davies's study of the Royal African Company is a notable addition to them.

The Royal African Company received its charter in 1672 as a joint-stock company engaged in trade with West Africa; it had a theoretical monopoly of English trade with that area until 1698. In 1698 the trade was thrown open, though the 'separate traders' had to contribute to the upkeep of the Company's forts. That obligation lapsed in 1712. Although the Company enjoyed the royal favour of Charles II and James II, it seems to have run into difficulties from the start. Its capital of £111,100 was inadequate for the scale of its operations, and by 1692 its debts amounted to more than £150,000. Its trade was eaten into by interlopers and was impaired by the incompetence or dishonesty of the Company's servants. Moreover it was a difficult and a complex trade for a joint-stock company to operate. There was the direct exchange of English goods and of re-exported East Indian textiles for African gold, ivory, wax, and redwood; there was the exchange of such goods for slaves, who were shipped to the West Indies; there was the remittance to England of the coin, bills, or sugar obtained for such slaves. This trade with the West Indies, where slaves were sold on credit, was more complicated and less triangular than the textbooks usually allege. It is hardly surprising that the Company faced great difficulties and failed to overcome them; it was virtually bankrupt half a century before it was wound up in 1752.

The Company's own records have fortunately survived, and from them Mr. Davies has written a full account of the Company's activities from 1672 to 1712; the anti-climax of the last 40 years he has rightly relegated to a brief epilogue. The result is an interesting and an important book, which throws much light on the African and West Indian trades, on shipping, and on the effects of war upon commerce. The Company's tangled finances are the subject of a masterly analysis which corrects Scott's very optimistic interpretation of some of the evidence. The Company in fact staggered from one desperate financial expedient to another, and neither heavy borrowing nor calls on existing shareholders could permanently solve its financial difficulties. The strength of this book rests, however, not only on a lucid account of the Company's history, but also on the placing of that history in its wider



setting. Mr. Davies has many wise and illuminating things to say about joint-stock companies in general, about capital investment in the seventeenth century, and about company finance. It is against this contemporary background that the fortunes of the Royal African Company now stand revealed.

*University of Manchester*

T. S. WILLAN

IN PROFIT AND POWER. A STUDY OF ENGLAND AND THE DUTCH WARS (London: Longmans, 1957. vi + 169 pp. 25s.) Charles Wilson has examined the causes and significance of the first two Anglo-Dutch wars of the seventeenth century. Not every one would agree with him that the Treaty of Breda marked a turning-point in relations between England and the United Provinces real enough to justify the author in concluding his study in 1667; indeed, the omission of the third war, that of 1672, from the analysis (apart from some sketchy comments) invalidates the subtitle and leaves the reader with a slighter impression of the book than it merits. One feels that the writer of the excellent and stimulating survey *Holland and Britain*, of the scholarly *Anglo-Dutch Commerce and Finance in the 18th Century* and of the massive tomes of the *History of Unilever* could easily have carried his story down to 1688 when the union of the two erstwhile rivals, in power if not in profit, alarmed European states with a prospect of naval supremacy that seemed as potentially tyrannical as the attempts at land hegemony by Louis XIV. The larger canvas would have given a more balanced picture, but there is much to be grateful for in the study presented to us. Mr. Wilson writes with beautiful clarity, with a thorough command of the economic life of the two nations (the brief sketch of the United Provinces on pages 2-7 could not be improved on), with understanding and sympathy for the points of view of both Dutch and English publicists and politicians of the age, with a sure eye for strategic considerations (the two maps are very helpful in this respect). Not the least of the book's merits is the way in which Mr. Wilson makes the reader familiar with the work of Dutch scholars of the period, Japikse, whose monograph on Anglo-Dutch relations between 1660 and 1665 was published in 1900, and Elias, who examined the prelude to the first war in 1920 and discussed the second war in 1930, above all. There is evidence also, though the author does not give footnote references to his unpublished material, of independent conclusions arrived at or strengthened by a re-reading of the English manuscript material already used by other scholars, Dutch and English, in the field; the handling of contemporary pamphlets is imaginative and resourceful (as e.g. in Chapter II where the author compares and contrasts Pieter de la Court's *Het Interest van Holland* of 1662 with Thomas Mun's *England's Treasure by Fforraign Trade* of 1664) and effectively proves Mr. Wilson's contention that much of what later ages came to regard as 'almost abstract theory was in reality rooted in the frictions that arose from the economic relationship between England and Holland in the seventeenth century'.

The compression in so short a book, as well as the concentration on the main theme of the study, has, naturally enough, led to some oversimplification of political issues; but the very brevity as well as the lucidity of the study makes it particularly useful for students, and a work of synthesis on Anglo-Dutch relations wholly admirable within its own limits.

*London School of Economics*

RAGNHILD HATTON

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TREASURY, 1660-1702. By S. B. Baxter.

London: Longmans. 1957. ix + 301 pp. 45s.

When did the Treasury become the dominant department in English administration and just what was involved in the process? The completion in recent years of the magnificent series of *Calendars of Treasury Books* down to 1714 has made it possible to answer these questions with some assurance. To Dr. Stephen Baxter, a young American scholar, belongs the credit of supplying some of the answers.

The story is a complex one. Parliamentary and Cromwellian finance had played havoc with 'the old form of Exchequer' control of national finance. In this, as in so much else, the Restoration was partial. The worsening financial situation in the 'sixties and the laziness of Lord Treasurer Southampton meant that there was no return to effective Exchequer control. Thereafter it became simply an audit or accounting agency: the Upper-Exchequer became a raised beach strewn with rich sinecures and archaic and cumbersome administrative methods. New techniques were soon evolved. Dr. Baxter suggests that the growth in Secret Service monies in the last quarter of the century arose from the practical necessity of avoiding paying exorbitant fees to Exchequer officials. At first there were several claimants for the administrative mantle vacated by the Exchequer—e.g. the Secretaries of State and the Privy Council. In January 1667-8, the Treasury secured its first notable triumph: an Order in Council required, among other things, that all money warrants be countersigned by the Treasury Lords. This victory was so important that it was 'written fair' on a board and hung up in the Treasury Chambers in Whitehall, on the site which the department has occupied ever since. Whether this notice board survived the fire of 1698 is not known, but in fact it signifies little for, by that date, theory had hardened into practice. The Treasury had emerged to something like full stature. Clearly one important turning point in this development is the Commission of five Treasury Lords of 1667-72 with Albemarle, Ashley and Clifford as its moving spirits and Sir George Downing as its efficient secretary. The abnormal strains of 'Dutch Finance' in the wars of William III and Anne may be said to have completed the process. 'Everybody has a mind to get into the Treasury', a note in the Spencer House Journals of March 1689 reads, 'Charmed with the name of the place where money groweth, forgetting the drudgery and the danger of it'. Dr. Baxter sketches the careers of some of these men, of efficient and long-serving secretaries like Henry Guy and William Lowndes (reputed author of the famous adage 'Take care of the pence . . .') and of the handful of hardworking clerks on salaries of £50 per annum who had made the development possible.

But it would be a mistake to assume that the course of this development was smooth or inevitable. At first the monarch, on occasion, attended meetings of the Board, and leading Treasury Lords perambulated with the Court; sometimes William III 'came to' the Treasury of an afternoon following what may be described as a routine or quasi-judicial meeting in the morning. The question naturally arises 'To what extent did the monarch influence decisions on policy?' Here I do not always accept the construction Dr. Baxter puts on the evidence. In any case, it is a pity that his study terminates in 1702. The long Treasurership of Godolphin (1702-10), with a woman on the throne, may well have been important in finally eliminating the monarch

from active participation in the day to day control of finance as well as in crystallizing long latent tendencies in the direction of departmentalism. On the question of limited Treasury initiative in proposing new forms of taxation, Dr. Baxter overlooks the testimony of Lord Lonsdale, himself a former First Lord, who wrote in 1695 '... in this employment I found we were called to make Brick without Strawe'; Godolphin, another Lord, used the same phrase at the same time—'the Councill taken att Court had hitherto been to ask lesse of Parliamēt than was necessarie for fear of offending them and the Parliamēt accordingle gave lesse than was asked'. Clearly, as Dr. Baxter contends, the need of active and effective leadership in the House of Commons on all aspects of finance was vital and may well have tipped the balance at particular junctures in favour of putting the Treasury in commission, rather than of entrusting responsibility to a Lord High Treasurer. After 1714 the Treasury is always a board of five Commissioners, a principle that became a characteristic feature in English administration. On the question of the control of the Treasury over patronage, especially appointments in the major revenue departments (Customs and Excise), Dr. Baxter joins issue with the present writer's earlier views. Space does not permit a reply in detail: suffice to say that in a Treasury Establishment Book drawn up for the guidance of Shelburne or the younger Pitt the principle of departmental control over the appointment of their 'inferior officers' is again asserted, though practice did not always conform with theory. Even in the English Customs, it states, 'by much the major part [of such appointments] are by warrant to the Commissioners of the Customs to issue their Deputations to the person named therein'.

Altogether this book is an important and valuable contribution. Dr. Baxter has a rare capacity for extracting kernels from shells and his style is terse and pithy.

*University of Durham*

EDWARD HUGHES

WHITE KENNETT, 1660–1728, BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH. By G. V. Bennett. London: S.P.C.K. 1957. xii + 290 pp. 42s.

To read an understanding treatment of a misunderstood subject is always an intellectual pleasure. When it also rescues a personal reputation from neglect and the ravages of criticism then the pleasure is deepened into a sort of moral satisfaction. Dr. Bennett's book is of this kind, being both a definitive biography and an important contribution to ecclesiastical history. Here for the first time is a full account of Kennett and his remarkable variety of achievement—as scholar, pamphleteer, administrator, preacher and churchman. His political development is clearly explained. As a young man he was a loyalist; it was only under the stress of the Revolution, and against his will, that he came to accept whiggism. The tragic accident of James II's accession started the process of his conversion. With the King a Papist, only whiggism could defend the national church. The alternative to it—divine-right passive obedience—which had been the proper guarantee of civil and ecclesiastical order in Restoration conditions, could now lead only to disorder and chaos—perhaps to Rome. On the convocation controversy in which Kennett first made a national reputation Dr. Bennett is particularly illuminating. His chapter on the pamphlet debates between Kennett and the moderates on the one hand and Atterbury and the 'high-flyers' on the other, is a triumphant



piece of précis-writing, and one that must have been very difficult to accomplish. In upholding the authority of king and archbishop over convocation, Kennett took his stand on a clear and ultimately unanswerable appeal to royal supremacy and the duty of canonical obedience. Atterbury's arguments, for all their tactical resource, were weak because founded on a confusion between ecclesiastical synods and parliamentary convocations. Perhaps the most important point to emerge is Dr. Bennett's own view that the 'high-flyers' were not really a high-church party. Their inspiration was political, not ecclesiastical or doctrinal; they were in reaction against the Revolution and the continental entanglements and wars to which it seemed to have led. In fact it was Kennett and the moderates who took the 'high' view of church-order—the duty of obedience to ecclesiastical superiors—and although they accepted royal supremacy they did not (with some exceptions) allow it to involve erastianism. Moreover it was the 'tory' high-flyers who used a 'whig' doctrine of history and the constitution—insisting on the existence of a fixed unchanging fundamental law on which were based the claims of a representative assembly, while the moderates, on the other hand, took a 'tory' view—arguing for the authority of king and primate, and asserting that both parliament and convocation had been the empirical creation of kings acting for specific purposes in specific circumstances. In later chapters Dr. Bennett has investigated the connection between ecclesiastical and political history in Anne's reign, showing the influence of ideas and emotions on national opinion in a way which is all the more convincing because it does not rest on over-simple generalizations connecting 'whig' with 'low-church' and 'tory' with 'high-church'. By careful use of his material, and by avoiding the temptation to argue from stereotyped words like 'whig' or 'low-church', Dr. Bennett has rescued ecclesiastical history from the ecclesiastical historians—or at least from the partisan enthusiasts who are always inclined to see prototypical Newmans in all 'high-flyers'. The moderates are presented not in their usual guise of political time-servers and men of ecclesiastical compromise, but as a party with high views of churchmanship; as firm defenders of episcopacy; towards protestant dissenters friendly but watchful; proud of their church, and active in its reform and the reformation of society; realistic in politics; scrupulous and scholarly in the historical research on which many of their policies were founded.

Some small criticisms may be offered. Dr. Bennett has not quite fulfilled his self-declared aim of writing ecclesiastical history in its 'social and political context', for he has told us very little indeed about the social context. And he does not give any verdict on that very large part of the 'Register and Chronicle' which remains in MS. (B.M., Lansdowne 1002-1010). There are also a few slips of no great moment and a few phrases one could quibble at. But here is a good historical study: written in a lucid and well-bred style; brief; above all, balanced, temperate and intelligent.

*Royal Holloway College, London*

R. G. LATHAM

## LATER MODERN

A SHORT HISTORY OF GERMANY. By Sir John K. Dunlop. London: Harrap. 1957. 160 pp. 8s. 6d.

HISTORY OF GERMANY FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE PRESENT DAY. By Minna R. Falk. New York: Philosophical Library. 1957. xx + 438 pp. \$6.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GERMAN PUBLIC MIND. A SOCIAL HISTORY OF GERMAN POLITICAL SENTIMENTS AND IDEAS. THE MIDDLE AGES—THE REFORMATION. By Frederick Hertz. London: Allen and Unwin. 1957. 524 pp. 35s.

All three books attempt to give a conspectus of German history, as a basis for the solution of present-day problems. The authors' differences in approach illustrate well the problems involved in such task. Sir John Dunlop was Land Commissioner in Hamburg and later British Consul General in this city, and his narrative is shaped by his desire to foster understanding between the two nations. The centre of gravity lies in the three concluding chapters on contemporary history (1918-45). But in the preceding pages also the book's purpose is to explain differences of outlook, behaviour and politics from history. Few men could have avoided mistakes in a compilation of this type. Here they frustrate the author's intention in the paragraph on the history of the German Knights, when the conversion of the Poles (instead of the Lithuanians) is placed at the end of the thirteenth century.

Professor Falk intends to give the *facts* which an American student would need to understand and judge Germany correctly. It is obvious that her design is to keep her narrative free from problems of interpretation. Of course she has not done so; she has merely failed to examine the basic assumptions underlying her selection. Her point of view represented sound politics in 1945, but it is doubtful whether it is sufficiently comprehensive to assimilate both the experiences of the eventful decade which has passed since and the complexities of German history.

The book by Dr. Hertz is much more substantial than the other two. The period which it covers ends in 1648. The author's excellent knowledge of modern literature on his subject is evident not only in his well-selected bibliographies, but also in his own descriptions of events and currents. His basic idea of understanding history by concentrating on the interplay between political action and public opinion promises a new solution of the problem how to use history as *magister vitæ*. But to reach this goal it would have been necessary to rearrange the conventional subject matter around the idea expressed in the book's title. That is not done. The reader finds a well-informed and readable introduction to the political history of the period, which includes a good deal of chronological detail of German campaigns in Italy. The characteristic features are paragraphs on the resistance of public opinion against imperial enterprise and, much more important, extensive chapters dealing with various types of publicistic literature. These carefully made summaries of little known texts are certainly useful, but isolated from their German and European background, as they are, they do not amount to the history of the German public mind which the author planned to write. The reason is not far to seek. Every specialist who has tried his hand at any problem in the history of medieval political thought knows the difficulty of establishing the relationship between this literature and the actual political

and social behaviour which it represents. For instance, after all the extensive and valuable work devoted to the Investiture contest and Hohenstaufen imperialism we are still lacking a competent essay on the impact of the events on the mind of the German ruling class and their changing attitudes as reflected in chronicles, commentaries on the Apocalypse and vernacular lyrics. But work of this type would be indispensable for such a synthesis as was planned by Dr. Herz.

*University of Liverpool*

HANS LIEBESCHÜTZ

FRANCE: GOVERNMENT AND SOCIETY. Edited by J. M. Wallace-Hadrill and J. McManners. London: Methuen. 1957. vii + 275 pp. 25s.

THE FRENCH NATION FROM NAPOLEON TO PÉTAIN. by D. W. Brogan. London: Hamish Hamilton. 1957. 328 pp. 25s.

EDGAR QUINET: A STUDY IN FRENCH PATRIOTISM. By Richard Howard Powers. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press. 1957. xvi + 207 pp. \$4.00.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF BARON HAUSSMANN. By J. M. and Brian Chapman. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson. 1957. viii + 262 pp. 25s.

Great Powers in decline have always held a fascination for historians, and it is perhaps for this reason that French history is at last attracting from British and American historians a degree of attention which until now has been withheld from all periods but the Revolution. It is pleasing to note in many of the new books a constructive attitude born of affection, a desire to appreciate the enduring gifts of France to civilization and not merely to trace the downward path of French performance in politics and French power in the world.

The twelve essays edited by Professor J. M. Wallace-Hadrill and Professor J. McManners were originally lectures delivered in the University of Oxford during 1955. They are intended to survey recent research and provoke thought on the interaction between government and society in all significant periods from prehistoric times to the Fourth Republic. There are some gaps in time, but the general trends which have been followed give the essays a satisfying continuity. The editors expect readers to have a basic knowledge of French history before coming to the book, but some of the essays could be read with profit by near-beginners. This is especially true of Miss Beryl Smalley's 'Capetian France', which is informative as well as provocative and must charm the most determined modernist by its style. Some later essays in the collection are less attractive: the account of Napoleonic institutions is pedestrian and the period from Waterloo to Vichy is handled with more efficiency than inspiration. This Oxford symposium should, however, prove helpful to all those who look for some pattern in France's past, and the final essay by Professor Max Beloff contains valuable suggestions towards an understanding of France's post-war instability.

The rôle to be filled by Professor Brogan's book is not so easy to assign. Each chapter contains interesting information on aspects of French life which are too often ignored in textbooks: economic conditions under the restored Bourbons, educational problems during the July Monarchy, developments in the arts during the Second Empire, the power of Freemasonry in the Third Republic. These excellent passages are fitted into an outline of political



events which is conventional in all but expression. The book concludes with the statement that the French people, having astonished the world in every field of achievement, failed at the end of a hundred and fifty years to find a political way of life worthy of their genius. It has apparently been Professor Brogan's object to describe the varied achievements and to record successive political failures. He refuses to account for either, and as far as the failures are concerned he suggests that historians would do well to accept them philosophically. The book will probably be unsatisfying to many readers in the long run, though few could fail to find delight in Professor Brogan's fascinating allusions and witty remarks.

From an immense store of biographical detail and literary knowledge Professor Brogan has sketched a series of pictures of life as the ordinary French citizen must have seen it at intervals during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. There is in French history from Waterloo onwards, however, a thread of passion and desperate striving which cannot be conveyed to the reader in terms of everyday events. Mr. Richard Howard Powers has attempted to pick up this thread in his study of Edgar Quinet, radical publicist and professor.

Quinet was not one of the great thinkers of the nineteenth century and Mr. Powers claims no intrinsic merit for the works which poured from his pen. They are important, he says, as having had some influence on the political life of France. Quinet fervently believed that France had been destined, by the Revolution, to lead other nations along the path of progress toward the bright dawn of civilization. Faith in this mission was for him the new religion and he spared no sacrifice in fighting those who opposed its advance. His attack upon the Catholic Church had an echo in the policies of the Third Republic. But Quinet is interesting for what he represented rather than for what he effected. Through Mr. Powers's admirable study it is possible to arrive at some understanding of attitudes which were common among radical sections of the population in nineteenth-century France but which are not easy to appreciate today. Quinet was one of those men who, having admired England in the 1820's, came in the 1830's to regard her as having been France's evil genius ever since Waterloo. He was a democrat who put more faith in dictatorship than in universal suffrage, a philanthropist who wanted war, a patriot who rejoiced at the defeat of French armies at Sedan. He is not an attractive person, and a subject so lacking in humour necessarily makes heavy reading, but Mr. Powers's book repays serious study.

A more entertaining book is Mr. and Mrs. Chapman's account of Baron Haussmann and the transformation of Paris. This is written in a lively style suited to an exuberant personality. The authors have been anxious to give to Haussmann the justice which he longed for in vain in his own lifetime. They do not exonerate him from charges of vandalism and bad taste but they refute the notion that he planned for purely military purposes, and in a balanced account of the great financial scandal which brought about his downfall they point out that his financial methods have been largely vindicated in recent times. Haussmann produced the Paris we know today, and his biography should be specially interesting to readers who know Paris well, but Mr. and Mrs. Chapman have not been so absorbed in this as to forget the contemporary importance of Haussmann as stage-manager to Napoleon III. They give some useful passages on administrative matters during the

Second Empire, which has too often been dealt with in purely political terms by historians.

*University of Liverpool*

IRENE COLLINS

WATERLOO TO PETERLOO. By R. J. White. London: Heinemann. 1957. ix + 202 pp. 18s.

Mr. R. J. White's book gives the Kingswood social history series an excellent start. It is not only very readable, but also provocative of fresh thought on most of the subjects the author touches upon. Mr. White has a dual purpose, to ride a hobby horse by setting forth the alleged virtues of a mythical pre-industrial 'Old England' which has never existed outside the imagination, and secondly, to trace the impact of popular politics immediately after Waterloo on a governmental apparatus, both local and national, which was still largely that of the eighteenth century. Britain had been cut off from the Continent by the French wars to a degree unknown during previous conflicts, but when peace returned a considerable section of the lower middle classes and skilled artisans of England is to be found with Jacobin ideas—twenty years after. This political movement coincided with various economic discontents resulting from the general business depression of 1816–19 and the distress among handloom weavers and framework knitters. The mingling of these fostered the popular belief that political reform was the prerequisite to economic betterment, a belief which was not shared by the Government, whose members had imbibed to differing degrees the doctrines of *laissez-faire* in economic matters. Looking back, it is very doubtful whether there was ever any danger of a British revolution. Lord Liverpool, Sidmouth and Castlereagh, to whom Mr. White is fairer than most historians, seem to have fallen into the error of later writers and endowed the tumults and pitiful plottings of 1816–21 with an exaggerated importance. This is a book which everyone interested in British history of the nineteenth century should read.<sup>1</sup>

*University of Manchester*

W. H. CHALONER

THE WAR IN THE MEDITERRANEAN, 1803–1810. By Piers Mackesy. London: Longmans. 1957. 430 pp. 45s.

The author of this handsome book gets to grips with his problem in his very first sentence: 'A century and a half after the collapse of the Peace of Amiens, the British conduct of the war against Napoleon still awaits the scholar.'

It does indeed, and this may seem the more strange because, outside the present century, the Napoleonic war was certainly the greatest we had ever waged, both in the area it covered and in the resources expended upon it. Yet the reason for its neglect is fairly clear. In our modern wars, some provision is made for the compiling of their history even while they are in progress, so that the historian, when he appears, finds not only that his material is there in abundance, but also that someone has realized, in advance, that he *would* appear, and has taken steps to make as easy as possible a task that can never be easy. But this was not done 150 years ago. The modern scholar finds the material all right, but nothing arranged in anticipation of his coming. He must face a war only less world-wide than our

<sup>1</sup> To Mr. White's bibliography might be added a reference to Mr. Donald Read's recent article on 'The social and economic background to Peterloo'.

twentieth-century conflicts with no conscious help at all from those who waged it.

Mr. Mackesy gives a good illustration of this handicap. He avers, with complete truth, that all successful wars must be controlled by some unified, and unifying, authority at the summit: that is, the Government—the ministers, co-ordinating the work of diplomacy, army, navy, transport, and finance alike, holding all the reins and so creating an overall ‘higher strategy’. But then he has to reveal the sorry fact that practically no records of Cabinet discussions were kept! The trouble lies, not with the material—there is plenty of that—but with what he calls a ‘continuous current of intention’ behind it all. This is lost—if indeed it ever existed after the death of Pitt. The only remedy, Mr. Mackesy holds, is to try and deduce a ‘current of intention’ from the mass of undigested material: and he realizes, wisely, I think, that this is no task for one man. What he attempts, therefore (again in his own words), is ‘to cut a vertical shaft into the mass . . . and, in a limited field, to search out some of the data on which a unified history of the war must be based’.

Truly, there would seem to be no other way, and it may be said at once that he has achieved very real and valuable success in this, his limited aim, which is ‘The war in the Mediterranean, 1803–1810’. No excuse is needed for dwelling at such length upon that aim because, on the long view, good as the achievement is, the aim is even better. It should become a kind of fingerpost pointing the way to any future scholar entering the field. The only previous attempt of modern times which can usefully be compared with it is C. N. Parkinson’s *War in the Eastern Seas* which, in its own way, does for the Indian Ocean and beyond much the same as this book does for the Mediterranean. And a series of such books would go far towards building up the ‘unified history’ of Mr. Mackesy’s vision.

Now it so happens—as indeed both of these very capable scholars themselves state—that their respective theatres are not the decisive theatres, those in which the war was *positively* fought and won. They are not ‘side-shows’, of course, because both are vital to the whole affair. But they are *negative* theatres: theatres where there had to be a struggle, and where it had to be won. Mr. Mackesy describes this ‘defensive’ aspect, I think, in his shrewd remark that ‘in a sense the Mediterranean war was never fought’. But this inevitably means a lack of highlights—no highly colourful campaigns, or large-scale actions crammed with drama. Still, no historian will be tempted to minimize their importance on that score. Rather, he will view them as strong, well-forged links in a long chain: not so significantly eye-catching, perhaps, as some of the other links, yet every whit as essential to the whole, because a chain with one link weak—or, worse, missing—is no chain at all.

In effect, what Mr. Mackesy succeeds in showing so effectively is not that the Mediterranean campaigns brought Napoleon to his knees, but that they made it certain he would not bring us to ours. More, designing, like the Germans after him, to break out of his Fortress of Europe to the south-east, he failed mainly because of our sea power so efficiently wielded by Collingwood, and so was compelled, ultimately, to fight it out on his own doorstep. The all-important sea-defence of Sicily was so successful that there was but little fighting. Yet it was none the less successful for that, since no fighting anywhere in that theatre could have led, by itself, to Napoleon’s downfall.



In fine, then, this is not a definitive history of the Napoleonic War, which is, at this stage, a near-impossibility. It is one essential chapter of it, detailed and comprehensive, and written with masterly competence. It remains now for scholars—and may Mr. Mackesy be one of them!—to tackle the other chapters and complete a work long overdue.

MICHAEL LEWIS

**GARIBALDI.** By Denis Mack Smith (London: Hutchinson. 1957. 216 pp. 12s. 6d.) is the first scholarly assessment of Garibaldi in English since Trevelyan's epic, written nearly fifty years ago. It gives a succinct account of the hero's quixotic early life, follows the author's recent monograph for the Sicilian expedition, then devotes nearly half its length to the period after 1860. Mr. Mack Smith explores the political background to Aspromonte and Mentana and explains convincingly why this highly popular 'man of the people', unique amongst contemporaries for his honesty and sympathy with the *popolo minuto*, made no attempt to become a politician himself. Sickened by the prevalent parliamentary corruption, Italy's only successful general advocated dictatorship as the means to regeneration. But, although a disciple of Machiavelli, there was no further resemblance between the 'caudillo at the head of his gauchos' and later imitators; Garibaldi had Mazzini's respect for the national rights of other people.

*University of Durham*

G. J. LOWE

**HENRY BROUGHAM** (London: Jonathan Cape. 1957. 326 pp. 25s.), by Frances Hawes, is a well-written popular account of the life of one of the most gifted and most strange of English nineteenth-century public men. It is based on well-known sources, and brings little that is new to the understanding of the difficult problems of Brougham's career and character; there are also some errors of fact.

Dr. A. Skevington Wood's **THOMAS HAWEIS, 1734-1820** (London: S.P.C.K. 1957. 292 pp. 50s.), is a scholarly study of one of the lesser but representative figures of the eighteenth-century evangelical revival. Haweis, a man of rather Calvinistic tenets, was one of the evangelicals who always remained firmly within the pale of the Established Church. His career and his writings well illustrate the complex inter-connections between the evangelical movement proper and those branches of the religious revival which developed on more or less sectarian lines outside the Establishment.

**THE VICTORIAN FRAME OF MIND 1830-1870.** By Walter E. Houghton. Yale University Press. London: O.U.P. 1957. xvii + 467 pp. 48s.

**THE SAINT SIMONIANS MILL AND CARLYLE. A PREFACE TO MODERN THOUGHT.** By Richard Pankhurst. London: Sidgwick and Jackson. 1957. 154 pp. 21s.

It was obvious to intelligent men of the eighteen-thirties that they were witnessing the dawn of a new age in economics, politics, and in the intellectual world. It is with the problems and ideas of this new age that both these books are concerned. Mr. Pankhurst's has the more limited theme; it is rather a jumble, but it contains some interesting material about the relations between the disciples of Saint-Simon, the English working-class radicals and socialists, and John Mill and Carlyle, two of the principal begetters of the mental climate of the Victorian period, which it is Professor Houghton's pur-

pose to depict. He aims at delineating 'those general ideas and attitudes about life which a Victorian of the middle and upper classes would have breathed in with the air . . . in a word, the frame of mind in which he was living and thinking.' His method is the study of Victorian literature and the attitudes which it reveals, since he argues, justly, that, in the Victorian period, there was an especially intimate connection between literature and life.

Much of the book is of great interest, more particularly his demonstration of the contradictory strands which run through the make-up of the time, its optimism and enthusiasm, its gnawing fears and doubts, religious, social, and intellectual. Like Mr. John Holloway, in *The Victorian Sage* (which he does not mention in his bibliography), he points out that many Victorian writers saw themselves primarily as teachers, expounding a philosophy of life. Doubt begins, however, when we ask how far the temper of an age can be judged from its intellectuals and their writings. The materials employed here are chiefly poetry and critical works, and less use is made of the novel, of sermons, of memoirs and biographies, or of newspapers. Clearly there is a limit to the amount which any author can read, but should the beam tip quite so heavily towards the ideas of the litterati as compared with those of other members of the middle and upper classes?

Professor Houghton's method is to analyse attitudes and states of mind; it is schematic, didactic, and rather selective. It raises, for this reviewer at least, the question how far qualities like 'enthusiasm' or 'seriousness' have meaning apart from the people or the institutions which embody them, and in which they are always found confused with other things. There is, for instance, much here about Victorian hero-worship and admiration for force; there is nothing about such individuals as 'Chinese' Gordon, Henry Lawrence, Henry Havelock, in whom that generation saw heroic qualities embodied. There is very little about the tradition of Christian statesmanship, of which Gladstone was an outstanding exemplar, or about the work of the reformers and philanthropists who tried to improve the condition of the towns and to ameliorate the rigours of the competitive system, though these evils themselves are mentioned. Carlyle's defence of Governor Eyre's high-handed actions in Jamaica is described, but nothing is said of Eyre's many critics, among whom was John Mill.

The tone of the book seems generally to be favourable to the critics and agnostics, the John Morleys or the Leslie Stephens. Consequently there is nothing about thinkers like F. D. Maurice and R. H. Hutton, who tried to reformulate old orthodoxies, and little about Newman and the Roman Catholic revival after 1850, or about Anglo-Catholicism. The impression of the age which emerges is therefore rather one-sided; it must be remembered, however, that it is both a difficult and courageous task to attempt a comprehensive synthesis of so complex a period.

*Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*

JOHN ROACH

PARNELL AND HIS PARTY 1880-90. By C. Cruise O'Brien. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1957. xii + 373 pp. 45s.

It is curious that although Parnell's career looms so large in the history of nineteenth-century Ireland very little precise and scholarly work has been done upon it. Apart from a few articles in learned journals and J. L. Hammond's *Gladstone and the Irish Nation* (itself not free from blemish) the

great bulk of the writing about Parnell has been by people who knew him personally and who, whether they looked back in anger or in sympathy, were seldom able to see him in any kind of clear perspective.

For this reason alone Dr. Cruise O'Brien's new study is welcome. Using much fresh material, maintaining a high standard of accuracy and objectivity, and writing with great elegance and clarity, he has dispelled many myths and given us, virtually for the first time, a Parnell divested of the penumbra of mystery and remoteness with which his own contemporaries were only too ready to surround him and which ever since has made it extraordinarily difficult to assess his real significance. This more realistic picture of the Irish leader is achieved, paradoxically enough, by dwelling less upon his biography and more upon the movement and the party which he led and to a great extent created. We are given chapters analysing the personnel of his parliamentary following, their relations with the constituencies, their financial problems and the way they were governed. The result is a most important contribution not merely to Anglo-Irish history but to the history of political parties in general and as such it deserves a wide public.

The author, of course, is concerned with policy as well as with institutions and the excellent sections in which he describes Parnell's transition from head of a semi-revolutionary organization to leader of a party wedded to constitutional action are especially valuable, since they bring out two points that are still far from being understood—the innate conservatism of the man and the essential moderation of his demands.

Parnell's impact upon British politics is no doubt outside the main scope of this work, but it cannot be ignored altogether and it must be said that Dr. Cruise O'Brien's attempts to deal with it are not quite so successful as the rest of his book, largely because he has not the same command of English as of Irish sources. He has used the Gladstone Papers, and to a lesser extent the Dilke and Campbell-Bannerman Papers, but there are other collections such as the Spencer and the Granville Papers (the Chamberlain Papers are not yet generally available) which throw a great deal of light on the whole intricate subject of liberal-nationalist relations but which are not represented here.

This criticism, however, does not affect the final verdict, which must be that this is easily the best book yet written about Parnell and one of the best about any aspect of Irish political history. And it is interesting to see that even though Dr. Cruise O'Brien has given more importance to Parnell's lieutenants and to party machinery than other writers have done, this does not involve any lessening of the stature of the central figure. That figure emerges from these pages as formidable as ever, confirming Gladstone's estimate of his great ally and adversary—'he was a political genius, a genius of most uncommon order'.

*Trinity College, Dublin*

F. S. L. LYONS

THE ORIGINS OF THE WAR OF 1914, vol iii. By Luigi Albertini, translated and edited by Isabella M. Massey. London: O.U.P. 1957. xiv + 772 pp. 70s.

With this final vast volume on the last days of peace—mainly the week from 31 July to 6 August—Dr. Massey finishes the task of translating and revising the late Luigi Albertini's monumental study, and earns our thanks for years



of work, skilfully performed. Most of the vital steps which led the powers to war were taken in the period covered by the second volume. Here, however, is the story of the Russian and German mobilizations, and an analysis of the legend that Austria mobilized before Russia; an account of the processes whereby the British cabinet brought itself into the war; and finally a survey of the reactions of the powers which, for the time being, stayed neutral: Italy, Turkey and the Balkan and Scandinavian countries, Switzerland, Spain, and the rest. There is no final summing up.

The main conclusion, however, would appear to be a condemnation of German conduct: 'with or without Russian general mobilization, with or without Austrian acceptance of the Anglo-German proposals, the treatment of Russia on 31 July would have been the same and the European war would have broken out all the same'. Von Moltke had been docile and circumspect on 29 July, while the Kaiser was still in his pacific phase; but on the 30th Wilhelm's angry annotations of the Tsar's telegram announcing partial mobilization emboldened von Moltke to press for German mobilization, which would mean immediate war unless Russia gave way. Bethmann-Hollweg, who was in Albertini's view making only a half-hearted and disingenuous attempt to forward plans for Anglo-German mediation, lacked the courage to resist the all-powerful army chiefs, but he was not averse to scoring a diplomatic triumph similar to Bülow's in 1909. The result was the ultimatum of 31 July calling for Russian demobilization within twelve hours, and Albertini believes that Bethmann's omission of the warning that 'mobilization means war' was deliberate. This 'shows that what was now regarded as important was, not to save the peace, but to win the war, and that to win the war precautions were neglected which might in fact have saved the peace'.

Albertini's conclusions are nearest to those of Bernadotte Schmitt among his predecessors. His merit lies in the extraordinary thoroughness and lucidity with which each separate train of events in each capital is clarified, and in a genuine impartiality. If he had a bias it was against war itself. He wrote with the problem of responsibility always in mind, and tended to base his judgements too narrowly on the proximate causes. Accordingly the book is not a complete answer to those who have tried to solve the problem by more *a priori* processes of reasoning, or have sought to give due weight to the broader influences and assumptions which shaped the conduct of the main actors.

English readers will find that in Chapter X he commits himself to the view that the war would not have taken place if Sir Edward Grey had warned the Germans before 29 July that Britain would fight. This is a familiar, but still very questionable assertion. Albertini puts it all down to Grey's 'slowness of intuition'—in other words, failure to realize before 29 July that Britain might be involved. But Grey had in fact spoken to Benckendorff and Lichnowsky on these lines on the 25th. Grey's warning to Lichnowsky on the 29th reached the Kaiser on 1 p.m. on the 30th—that is, before the ultimatum to Russia—and far from restraining the Kaiser it exasperated him further ('the biggest, most unheard-of piece of English pharisaism . . . Oho! the mean cheat!'). According to von Haeften, Moltke on the 31st took it for granted that England would fight, and everything seems to confirm Grey's own later view, that the German plans for a swift victory covered the risk of British

intervention. Albertini also waves aside impatiently the suggestion that the British cabinet felt that it alone was in a position to mediate with relative impartiality between the European groups. Yet all in all this is very much the best account we have of British diplomacy in the 1914 crisis. Perhaps the most original and interesting section however is that on Italian policy, and Chapter V on the Schlieffen plan is also of great value.

*London School of Economics*

W. N. MEDLICOTT

L'EPOQUE CONTEMPORAINE: A LA RECHERCHE D'UNE CIVILISATION NOUVELLE. By Maurice Crouzet. Tome 7 et dernier de l'*Histoire Générale des Civilisations*. Paris: Presses Universitaires. 1957. 824 pp. Paper covers, 3000 francs; bound, 3600 francs.

M. Crouzet, editor of the *Histoire Générale des Civilisations*, brings the series to a close with this notable, large-scale work from his own pen. It has been a salutary experience to read it, for it presents the history of our times from a broad, European point of view, lacking the self-centredness of an English or an American account. It has the realism of either, but without the self-pity or the air of superiority. It succeeds admirably in pointing out the fundamental things in the history of our times.

Its theme is the transformation of the world between 1914 and 1955 and it ends with the Bandung Conference. In 1914 the European hegemony of the world and the leadership of the white peoples were both complete: it was the apogee of the liberal capitalist world. After two world wars not only was European hegemony at an end, but the world was divided into three parts: the West under American leadership; the Russian system; and the former subject and colonial peoples, now free or well on the way to freedom and so far uncommitted to either of the two great contestants. The half-century has, moreover, produced more than a world divided and in disequilibrium: it has 'completely transformed the structure of the economy and of society, has placed science and art under a new set of principles, has posed all the old problems in terms which are almost entirely new, and has given to all those who have come to manhood between 1900 and 1930 a painful feeling of insecurity and of the end of the world'.

In effect, M. Crouzet has written an extended essay in contemporary history, descriptive rather than narratory, full of facts and figures but at the same time philosophical. He is ready in generalization but unwilling to judge; his is the cool, unflinching scrutiny, without passion. He presents his work in four parts, subdivided into books and chapters. Part 1, on the decline of Europe, is concerned with the first world war and its political, economic and intellectual effects, and with the 'Great Depression' and its corresponding results, including the rise of fascism and nazism. Part 2 is a careful and detailed description of Soviet Russia before 1939. Part 3, 'A divided world, and the break-up of the colonial empires', gives the history of the first and second world wars, surveys the free world since 1945, the Communist world, and the subject and colonial countries: it is here that the history of China, India, the Arab lands, Africa and Latin America is recounted from the beginning of the century. Part 4 on the development of science and technology since 1940 completes the work. The whole represents an ingenious and effective organization of diverse and intractable materials. There are at least two perhaps unavoidable omissions. There is no attempt to portray the

leaders or give any weight to character and personality in affecting the course of events. There is no account of the political and diplomatic history of the times: the League of Nations, 'Munich', the Italian war against Abyssinia, to give three examples, are barely mentioned.

The work has two major and several lesser merits. It is excellent in the comparisons it gives of the experience of different countries; for example, in measures of economic recovery in the thirties in the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Japan, in the development of the 'welfare state' in other countries beside Great Britain, in the colonial policies of the powers, in the concentration of control over the press, in the growth of state intervention in the economy. And it treats history as a unity, showing how literature and art have been affected, particularly since the second world war, by the advances in physics and biology, and how government in Europe has been influenced by the weaknesses of the economy. Indeed, an economic interpretation is a strong element in M. Crouzet's composition.

Among its minor merits are the skilful use of figures of production, employment and trade; the constant reference to population growth and to migrations and emigration; the lucid accounts of the development of nuclear physics and of genetics, antibiotics, synthetics and other applications of scientific advances. There are several excellent maps and charts, e.g., of the campaigns of the two wars and of the urban development of Russia. The 48 illustrations—photographs of high quality and beautiful reproduction—are well-chosen and often unhackneyed: a freeway in Los Angeles, the Oak Ridge atomic factory, a Detroit supermarket from the air, rice pickers in Cambodia, a pile of bodies at Buchenwald, an unusual picture of soldiers in a trench in 1917, a new year's day procession before the Emperor in Japan, pictures of Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, are among the best. A chronological summary, a sound bibliographical essay (made up mostly of books in French and English), a full index and detailed table of contents complete the book.

M. Crouzet's achievement deserves an international audience. If translated into English the book might obtain a share of the market for college texts in recent world history in the United States; and if a knowledge of contemporary history were required of them it would serve sixth-formers and undergraduates in Great Britain very well. It might set them pondering some of its generalizations. One is that the events of the half-century have strengthened conservatism in the western world, partly by showing up the contradictions in bourgeois democracy and liberal capitalism, between the structure of society and the forces of production, between the political sovereignty of the masses and the economic sovereignty of a privileged minority. At the same time inequality, outside Great Britain, has been increased rather than diminished. In the same way M. Crouzet sees in the replacement of British by American leadership a shift from policies which encouraged liberal and democratic movements on the Continent, to a policy resting on conservative forces. His conclusion is sombre. The chief problem of the century is the feeding of the world's growing population, the undernourishment of one-third of mankind, the differences in the standard of living between West and East, between Europe and Africa. The newly-free countries wish to be neutral between Russia and the West, but they cannot be; and the ability of the two great powers to satisfy their material and intellectual needs will



decide their choice and incline the balance in favour of one camp or the other.

*University of Chicago*

C. L. MOWAT

In the introduction to the hitherto unpublished *VOYAGE FROM UTOPIA* (London: Lawrence and Wishart. 1957. 192 pp. 21s.) of John Francis Bray, Dr. M. F. Lloyd-Pritchard adds greatly to our knowledge of the life of this early English Socialist; but the *Voyage* itself lacks the bold originality of Bray's earlier *Labour's Wrongs and Labour's Remedy*.

Wood, unlike coal and iron, has not been a favoured commodity of the economic historian. Yet its importance as fuel and raw material needs no underlining. In *TIMBER: A HISTORICAL SURVEY OF ITS DEVELOPMENT AND DISTRIBUTION* (London: Harrap. 1957. 303 pp. 25s.) Mr. Bryan Latham has usefully and attractively helped to remedy this deficiency. Though primarily intended for the general reader, this book has also something for the specialist, particularly if his interest lies in the tropical timber trade.

*THE 'REVOLT OF THE FIELD' IN LINCOLNSHIRE* (Lincolnshire County Committee, National Union of Agricultural Workers. n.d. [1957]. 168 pp. 3s. 6d.): Mr. Rex C. Russell is to be congratulated for compiling, and the Agricultural Workers' Union for sponsoring, this collection of materials for a history of farmworkers' trade unions in Lincolnshire between 1872 and 1892. The provincial press is admirably used to illuminate rural conditions in these years of deepening agricultural depression.

Sir George Clark's *EARLY MODERN EUROPE, FROM ABOUT 1450 TO ABOUT 1720* (London: O.U.P. Home University Library. 1957. 261 pp. 7s. 6d.), a reprint of his contribution to *The European Inheritance* (1954), is neither a beginner's book nor a textbook, but a refreshing essay and commentary upon the events and civilization of the age.

In *THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE BOARD OF TRADE, 1830-55* (Heinemann. 1957. viii + 123 pp. 15s.) Roger Prouty explains how 'the Board of Trade became a board of industry'. This is a theme to excite the interest of both the economic and the administrative historian. Mr. Prouty's study promises much, but in the event is limited to a simple account of the changing relationship between the Board and the shipping industry—an important but narrow area of its activities. Mr. Prouty has indicated a useful field of research, but the major labour remains for other hands.

*THE EGBA AND THEIR NEIGHBOURS, 1842-1872*. By Saburi O. Biobaku. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1957. vi + 128 pp. 21s.

*THE BRITISH IN MOMBASA, 1824-1826*. By Sir John Gray. London: Macmillan. 1957. viii + 216 pp. 7s. 6d.

*ANGOLA IN PERSPECTIVE. ENDEAVOUR AND ACHIEVEMENT IN PORTUGUESE WEST AFRICA*. By F. Clement C. Egerton. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1957. 272 pp. 30s.

In spite of their predominantly specialist appeal, these three books are not without attractions for the student of the expansion of Europe in general.

Dr. Biobaku's work will be appreciated most by readers who have a detailed knowledge of the Lagos-Abeokuta-Ibadan regions of Nigeria and of the Yoruba. Yet it deserves to be welcomed by all who wish to see the continuation of the best elements of British post-graduate historical research

in the tremendous new task of writing the history of the emerging African nations. Dr. Biobaku is the second West African graduate of a British university to publish a book in the *Oxford Studies in African Affairs*. The first was Dr. K. O. Dike with his important *Trade and Politics in the Niger Delta, 1830-1885*, and it may be said without hesitation that Dr. Biobaku's study is a worthy successor to this. If the new West African history is to be written by such scrupulous investigators, those western observers who often cast an anxious eye on the nationalist writing of modern Africa may be assured that there are some African historians who will not easily be tempted along the path of rash historical generalization. Particularly valuable is Dr. Biobaku's account of his use of oral evidence, the search for which took him over six thousand miles in six months. It is to be hoped that he will expand this section elsewhere, for it has no small methodological interest.

Those who are interested in the dialectic of history (either as metaphor or process) should find some interesting examples in Dr. Biobaku's study of what an 1853 British witness of the Egba called 'the most extraordinary republic in the world'. Not only does he show that the Egba, who had been heralded by the missionaries as the vanguard of civilization in that part of Africa, came to be regarded by the Lagos authorities as the major obstacle to peace in the neighbourhood, but he demonstrates also that, in this area, the extension of trade, the mid-nineteenth-century remedy for slavery in the interior of Africa and inter-tribal warfare, actually, for a time, increased both of these threats to peace and good government.

Indigenous hostilities often provided the opportunity for European rule to establish itself. This is as clear from Sir John Gray's study of the abortive attempt by Captain William Fitzwilliam Wentworth Owen of H.M.S. *Leven* to set up a British protectorate over Mombasa as it is from Dr. Biobaku's work. Sir John Gray, former Chief Justice of Zanzibar, is already known for the meticulous articles on East African history which he has contributed to local historical journals. This monograph (a welcome first volume of the *Transactions of the Kenya History Society*) should interest not merely historians of Africa but also students of the anti-slavery movement, although it is a little tiresome to find Lecky's often-quoted remark on the virtuous character of this movement in Britain employed yet again. One does not have to endorse the economic determinist thesis of Dr. Eric Williams in his *Capitalism and Slavery* or to deny the manifestly disinterested character of much of the British fight against slavery, to realize that it was the vehicle for some self-interest, of which the subtler attractions of power and the pride of altruism are not the least important elements. For the naval officers other than Owen who were concerned with the affair of the British at Mombasa in 1824-6, Sir John provides adequate biographical sketches. Lieutenant J. J. Emery, who bore so much of the brunt of 'Owen's Protectorate', and from whose diary ample extracts are given, emerges as a particularly engaging character and one who deserves a biography in his own right.

Colonel Egerton's book on Angola might have been as welcome as Dr. Biobaku's or Sir John Gray's, for British ignorance of Portuguese Africa is lamentable. And, as Colonel Egerton stresses, what British writing there is on Portuguese West Africa has concerned itself mainly with the less attractive features of Portuguese administration. Unfortunately, he swings the pendulum

too much in the other direction. There is undoubtedly, as the parallel of Brazil suggests, much truth in his claim that the Portuguese established 'a natural human relationship with the natives which took no account whatever of differences in race and colour. They are the only Europeans who have ever appeared in Africa of whom this can be so truly and fully said.' Yet it is also true that the word for 'whip' in at least one Central African and one East African language is the Portuguese *chicote*.

Since H. W. Nevinson's writings on Portuguese West Africa at the beginning of the century, it would seem that any attempt to put Angola in perspective for British readers must give particular attention to the Portuguese obligatory labour system. Colonel Egerton's main examination of this question, however, is restricted to five pages in his Conclusion. Elsewhere, he challenges the criticisms of diamond production in Angola by the distinguished Brazilian sociologist, Gilberto Freyre. And he seems to pass rather rapidly by the African revolts against Portuguese rule; nowhere, for example, does he deal with Buta's attack on San Salvador in 1913. It may well be that British critics of the administration of Angola have exaggerated in the past and have failed to appreciate the Portuguese colonizing genius. But Colonel Egerton does not face their charges as squarely as seems to be necessary—indeed, he does not even mention the names of those he most abhors but refers to them obliquely.

Yet *Angola in Perspective* is a very readable and informative book. Its footnotes provide a useful bibliography of Portuguese and some English writing on Angola and Portuguese colonization in general. And it would be wrong to give the impression that Colonel Egerton is not aware of some Portuguese shortcomings, in spite of his enthusiasm for all things Lusitanian. Although his work tries to combine the functions of a historical treatise and a travel book, it is a very useful introduction to Portuguese West Africa which any student of the expansion of Europe could read with profit.

Each of these three books deserves a place in the library of any person or institution that is engaged in the important task of being well-informed about the so-called 'dependent territories'.

*University of Edinburgh*

GEORGE SHEPPERSON

The belief in the so-called 'double jeu' of Vichy is founded in part on an alleged secret agreement concluded between Pétain and Churchill. General G. Schmitt in *LES ACCORDS SECRETS FRANCO-BRITANNIQUES DE NOVEMBRE-DÉCEMBRE 1940: HISTOIRE OU MYSTIFICATION* (Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1957. 216 pp. 700 fr.) submits this legend to a minute examination which reduces the supposed evidence for the agreement to shreds. If he is not quite so devastating in dealing with the evidence for the secret telegrams of November 1942 from Pétain to Darlan, it is only because this is almost entirely lacking.

George von Rauch's *HISTORY OF SOVIET RUSSIA* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1957. viii + 493 pp. 42s.) is an English translation of a book originally published in German. It can be recommended as a serious and painstaking piece of work which will meet a real need. The style is uninspired; and rather too much is devoted to Soviet foreign policy and very much too little to the non-Russian nationalities. It would also have been better if the book had ended with the death of Stalin instead of trying to take the story



almost to the day before publication. A. Yarmolinsky's *ROAD TO REVOLUTION* (London: Cassell. 1957. xiii + 369 pp. 25s.) gives a systematic and lively account of the ideas and activities of Russian radicals and revolutionaries and of the various movements and groups into which they formed themselves between 1790 when Radischev fathered radicalism in Russia by publishing his *Journey from Petersburg to Moscow* and the middle years of Alexander III's reign when one important phase of the Russian revolutionary movement ended and another even more important phase was in process of beginning. It is a book which all students of Russian history will welcome and appreciate. But others may wish to have had the political and social background more fully described.

SIR HARRY JOHNSTON AND THE SCRAMBLE FOR AFRICA. By Roland Oliver. London: Chatto and Windus. 1957. 368 pp. 30s.

Unquestionably, this is an important book. Dr. Oliver, a pioneer in the major re-writing of African history now in progress, has used the Foreign Office archives, and many private collections, to describe a remarkable career. Johnston travelled in Angola, the Congo, to Kilimanjaro, and found himself increasingly involved in expansionist politics; as Vice-Consul in the Oil Rivers he appreciably advanced British authority in southern Nigeria; his work was decisive in the establishment of the Nyasaland protectorate. The most fascinating part of this fascinating book describes the dual rôle as between the South Africa Company and the Imperial government which Treasury parsimony forced upon Johnston: a disreputable episode in Imperial policy, from which he emerges with great credit. After serving in Tunis, Johnston went as Special Commissioner to Uganda, where he reformed the protectorate administration and concluded with the Baganda the decisive agreement of 1900. All this he had achieved by the age of forty-two, not to speak of six books, numerous attractive paintings, and substantial contributions to African botany, zoology and linguistics.

These important episodes in the 'scramble for Africa' are described with clarity and insight. But the need to compress them, with much background material, into 360 pages has forced his biographer to cut down somewhere. Hence, although Johnston's evolutionary rationalism is illustrated by quotation, the formative influences are not examined; the name of Winwood Reade, whom he greatly admired, does not appear. Johnston's curious Liberian connections get three pages; his Parliamentary candidatures, one; his schemes for Anglo-German partnership are discreetly dismissed in half a paragraph. On these interesting, if peripheral, subjects Oliver can hardly take us beyond the evidence of Johnston's own memoirs—whose unreliability he has earlier demonstrated with conclusive skill. There are also a few odd slips: Joseph Chamberlain is knighted in the index; Johnston, having been born in 1858, was not thirty-four in 1886; his half-brother, not his step-brother, died in 1878. Generally, the background is more surely sketched for East than for West Africa; for example, administrators like Faidherbe, Glover and Kennedy had envisaged some of the problems of penetrating the interior with some precision long before 1886.

But perhaps the largest question-mark concerns Johnston's personal stature. That his was a remarkable character is clear; no ordinary man of thirty, unaided by family connections or University education, could have earned

Salisbury's confidence in so spectacular a manner as he did. His energy in administration, his courage in adversity, the restless versatility of his mind: all these qualities are amply illustrated from Johnston's own copious despatches and publications. To what place in African history do they entitle him? Oliver believes that, had blackwater fever not cut short Johnston's tropical career, his reputation in African administration might now equal Lugard's. This may be so; it does not emerge conclusively from the evidence presented. Penetrating, far-sighted, and humane though Johnston's views on African development often were, they seem to have lacked that steady consistency which Lugard drew from his deep sense of moral responsibility. The widest claims remain unproven. Further, although on such a question as the deportation of Ja Ja Oliver makes himself Johnston's advocate, he hardly refutes the astringent criticisms which Salisbury, while maintaining his confidence, voiced with his usual clear-headedness. Many readers, while giving thanks for this wise and clear account of Johnston's work, will be stimulated to pose new questions about the man.

*University of Aberdeen*

J. D. HARGREAVES

THE NATIVE POLICIES OF STAMFORD RAFFLES IN JAVA AND SUMATRA: AN ECONOMIC INTERPRETATION. By John Bastin. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1957. xx + 163 pp. 30s.

THE COLEBROOKE-CAMERON PAPERS: DOCUMENTS ON BRITISH COLONIAL POLICY IN CEYLON 1796-1833. Selected and edited by G. C. Mendis. O.U.P. 1956. Vol I, lxiv + 404 pp., Vol II, 416 pp. 105s.

Using both Dutch and British sources Dr. Bastin has sought to define the relation of Raffles' work in Java and Sumatra to the general development of British colonial policy. The authors of the Residential System in Malaya in the 1870's tended to look back to Raffles as the father of indirect rule, but Dr. Bastin demonstrates their mistake. He reaffirms Dr. Furnivall's conclusion that Raffles' aim in Java was to bring the country under the direct rule of European bureaucracy, even though later in Sumatra financial stringency forced him to rely largely on the chiefs as his administrative instrument. Dr. Bastin prefers to call Raffles' policy one of paternalism or beneficent autocracy, but his account of the administrative shifts to which Raffles had to resort strengthens the doubt whether he had a policy in any strict sense. Presiding precariously over temporary administrations Raffles appears not as a man of settled principle but as a mercurial opportunist, ready to catch at any idea which promised striking effects. He pursued none consistently or persistently, not even that of free trade for which he is usually held in honour. Raffles makes his mark in British colonial history not by virtue of any distinctive administrative policy but by his imaginative attempt to transform the entire Malayan Archipelago into a second Indian empire. Dr. Bastin fails to explore the pedigree of Raffles' administrative schemes, drawing his analogies from Fiji in the 1870's and Africa under Lugard, rather than from contemporary India which was the fountain-spring of every type of British administrative tradition. Whether Raffles' system was original, or whether he derived his land revenue scheme from Madras and his separation of judicial and revenue functions from Bengal, is not properly examined. Raffles claimed originality for the former, stating that the account of the *ryotwar* system in the Fifth Report of 1812 did not reach him until after his

scheme was devised. By passing over these questions Dr. Bastin is unable to demonstrate that Raffles exercised any seminal influence on British colonial administration. The traditional view that his fame rests on the foundation of Singapore has still much to commend it. Dr. Bastin writes easily, but his considerable scholarship would have been used to better effect if he had confined himself to the Java period and not devoted one-half of his slim volume to the relatively unimportant work of Raffles in Sumatra.

Dr. Mendis' book illustrates the way in which Ceylon slipped away from the Indian tradition of centralized bureaucracy under the tight control of London, and became the constitutional pioneer of the non-European Crown Colony. Many have ascribed the happier historical relationship between Ceylon and Britain to this fact. Not only was the representative assembly developed earlier in Ceylon but the unofficial element was given much greater weight. The looser control of the Colonial Office left much more power and initiative in local hands. Dr. Mendis points out the debt of the Colebrooke-Cameron reforms to Utilitarian ideas, and undoubtedly Cameron's judicial reforms were the Benthamite stock-in-trade. But they were made subservient to the liberal policy of encouraging self-government and associating Sinhalese in the administration. In striking contrast James Mill staunchly opposed this type of liberalism for India, and did everything to strengthen the Indian tradition of despotic centralized bureaucracy, believing good government and not self-government to be the proper instrument of Indian happiness. The truth is that in colonial policy towards non-European dependencies strict Utilitarians threw their weight on the side of authority rather than liberty.

The documents could have been much more rigorously pruned and the price of the work correspondingly reduced.

*University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland*

ERIC STOKES

## GENERAL

THE VICTORIA HISTORY OF THE COUNTIES OF ENGLAND: WILTSHIRE, Vol. V. Edited by R. B. Pugh and Elizabeth Crittall. Published for the Institute of Historical Research by the Oxford University Press. 1957. xxi + 383 pp. £5 5s.

The Wiltshire V.C.H., when completed, will be a notable landmark in the study of English Local History. Its late start made it possible to adapt the accepted plan to changing interests and conditions of research. The expansion of the general volumes, the emphasis on the modern period and the use of local records all reflect significant trends in scholarship over the past fifty years. In this latest volume the new approach is strikingly evident. Instead of the single chapter on 'Political History', which every V.C.H. series has hitherto included, we have a detailed study, extending to more than 300 pages, of two complementary themes—the government and the parliamentary history of the county. Neither was within the recognized scope of the local historian when the V.C.H. was planned. The important work that has been done in both fields since then has helped to bring local studies into a new and closer relation with national history. The volume under review is, in the first place, a measure of a great change in historical outlook.

The dual theme is worked out in nine chapters, by eight different authors,



dealing alternately with administrative and parliamentary history. For the Middle Ages, Mr. Pugh's exhaustive account of the King's government in Wiltshire is supplemented by a chapter on the Feudal Liberties. The period from the Reformation to the 1830's is divided into two; for county administration at 1660, for parliamentary history, for some reason, at 1689. The final chapters bring the story down to 1952. The whole is less of a unity than the volume on the ecclesiastical history of Wiltshire which was published last year. The total impression is rather too much of a series of studies. To some extent this is unavoidable, especially in a subject which reflects so much of the changing complexities of the national life as parliamentary representation. Thus Professor Bindoff's and Miss Ransome's articles are both admirable in themselves; but the former, dealing with the Tudors and Stuarts, necessarily includes a good deal of the political history of the county, whereas the emphasis in the eighteenth century is much more on patronage and borough-mongering. But the scheme, particularly as applied to local government, involves repetition and the concentration on the dominant features of each period means that some interesting threads, distinctive of the Wiltshire pattern, are not followed through. Mr. Hodgett's concluding remark that the importance of the liberties continued 'well into the sixteenth century' finds no echo in Mr. Hurstfield's account of Tudor and early Stuart administration.

Occasionally there are contradictions, as on pp. 107 and 170, where Mr. Hurstfield and Dr. Ward respectively give somewhat different impressions of the extent of the survival of manorial courts. It would have been better if the two aspects of the middle period, *c.* 1530-1830, could each have been dealt with by one writer. The most successful chapter, in presenting a continuous theme of development, is undoubtedly Dr. Lewis's, on County Administration since 1835. The corresponding section on parliamentary history is unfortunately rather slight.

These are criticisms, not of the plan of the volume, but of the details of its execution. They in no way detract from the high standard of scholarship and thoroughness of treatment of nearly all the several chapters. Moreover, some significant generalizations do emerge; and they would incidentally have been easier to trace with the aid of a more adequate subject index. Wiltshire might be described as the original breeding-ground of rotten boroughs and Old Sarum was already fulfilling in the fourteenth century the same functions as justified its survival in the eyes of opponents of the Reform Bill. It is interesting to follow out the varying proportions of local men and outsiders among the Wiltshire M.P.s and to note that the former, which fell steeply after the Revolution and continued to decline throughout the eighteenth century, rose again, as markedly, in the Reformed Parliaments.

The volume also includes two other topics. Mrs. Waterhouse contributes a full and careful study of public health and medical services in Wiltshire, a new theme, closely related in its later phases to county administration. The final chapter, on education, by Miss E. E. Butcher, departs from the traditional plan in that about half of it is devoted to a survey of the county as a whole. A special word of praise, however, must be given to her histories of individual schools, some of which are models of their kind.

*University of Birmingham*

PHILIP STYLES

Professor H. R. Trevor-Roper has collected a number of essays, reviews and papers in an edition of his *HISTORICAL ESSAYS* (London: Macmillan. 1957. 298 pp. 21s.) which impresses more by the sheer extent of his informed interest than by offering any notable advance in knowledge. For his ability to speak with authority and insight on matters as diverse as medieval merchants and modern historians, the English Reformation and the myth of Charles I, seventeenth-century bishops and seventeenth-century Jews, Hobbes, Halifax and Lytton Strachey, he assuredly deserves only respect and appreciation. The range of subjects is even wider than indicated, but it does seem a little much when Homer and Ibn Khaldoun are also swept into the net. Professor Trevor-Roper has a habit of using a book, whose content he can hardly criticize from a professional point of view, as a peg for an evocative and descriptive essay and (sometimes) an attack on his particular bugbears, dullness and obscurantism. This is legitimate enough in the pages of a weekly journal, but it still leaves one wondering whether it is the best way to review a book. The author may well reply that proper reviews are not worth reprinting, while essays that take their beginning from some book or other are. Certainly, these papers were well worth presenting in a body, if only because they are excellently written, deal with fascinating and important topics, and always have something to say. In fact, they are full of fun and sense.

The longer articles, which did not start life as book-reviews, are particularly striking. One has never read anything more perceptive on Erasmus. The analysis of 'The Social Causes of the Civil War' assumes agreement with Professor Trevor-Roper's position in that famous controversy, but that does not rob it of both learned weight and persuasive penetration. The seventeenth century remains the author's homeground: while most of the book repays attention, the pieces on his chosen field should be required reading in schools and universities. Here and there the book contains errors, the most curious of which divides the Carthusian monastery at Sheen (or Richmond) into two houses at those identical if differently named places. An attractive *penchant* for generalization produces now and again something doubtful and very occasionally—dare one say it?—even something silly. Professor Trevor-Roper can be unfair; he is so to Reginald Pole—but how well one can understand why he should be. He can be rash; it is by no means certain that Coulton and Baskerville have said the last word on English monasticism, a criticism which looks forward to Professor Knowles's next volume and is in no way intended to resuscitate Gasquet. He can also be splendidly generous, as in his defence of the Catholic laity against their own clergy or in his appreciation of Clarendon. Lastly, it must be stressed that these essays make a book because they receive unity and significance from the presence of an active and powerful mind, the mind of a true historian seeking the inwardness of things.

*Clare College, Cambridge*

G. R. ELTON

THE ENGLISH WOMAN IN HISTORY. By Doris Mary Stenton. London: Allen and Unwin. 1957. vii + 363 pp. 35s.

It has often been the fate of women to become the subject of the amateur historian, the writer of romantic biography or the devotee of feminist causes. There is certainly nothing amateur, nothing romantic and nothing unduly

feminist in Lady Stenton's study of *The English Woman in History*. It is a fine example of that rare kind of book, the by-product of a life-time of austere scholarship. The author's intention has been 'to display the place women have held and the influence they have exerted within the changing pattern of English society from the earliest down to modern times'. Without the equipment and experience of a professional medievalist the earlier chapters could not have been written and it is doubtful whether any other scholar could have persuaded the marginal land of these early centuries to yield so rich a harvest for our enjoyment. Here most readers will find all, and much more than all, they could reasonably hope to learn about the position of medieval women and these chapters are outstanding as a contribution to knowledge. The treatment of the later centuries is perhaps inevitably less satisfying for, if any sort of balance is to be maintained, it must be highly selective. Each reader will have his own criticisms of the author's decisions about what to include and what to omit and will be disappointed that some familiar figures are absent or some expected sources have been ignored. But the stamp of quality remains throughout. Lady Stenton says herself that as she progressed down the ages, beyond the period for which she had been trained, her interest and excitement grew. This pleasurable feeling of discovery is communicated to the reader and gives the later chapters a zest and impetus which carries them through to the end of the long story, an end arbitrarily fixed in 1869, the year of the publication of John Stuart Mill's *The Subjection of Women*.

To many readers the most striking of Lady Stenton's conclusions will be that in Anglo-Saxon England women 'were more nearly the equal companions of their husbands and brothers than at any other period before the modern age'. The Norman conquest shattered this 'rough equality' and imposed upon women the legal subjections proper to a military society. The Norman yoke lasted until the abolition of feudal tenures in 1660 and indeed longer, for the shackles of the Common Law had been forged in feudal times and were not relaxed until the nineteenth century. In the classes directly affected by feudal tenures it was only the widows, protected by Magna Carta from forcible remarriage, who enjoyed any considerable measure of freedom, although it is worth remembering that in the frequent and prolonged absences of their lords, wives were left to manage estates and households on a scale which would certainly be considered in the modern world to afford a career for a professional woman. Lady Stenton says that the wives of peasant farmers played an essential part in production and were consequently of greater account. We should have liked to hear more of the wives of merchants and townsmen; although they were not in the same way economically necessary they too seem to have enjoyed a considerable measure of independence; but the evidence for both classes is scarce.

We are told that it was not only the legal innovations of the Normans but also the coming of Christianity which threatened the equality of Anglo-Saxon women by its substitution of Mediterranean for Germanic ideas about the relations of the sexes. But against the theoretical setbacks resulting from the teaching of St. Paul must be set the new opportunities of education, travel and administrative experience which came in the wake of Christianity. One would like to hear more about the nunneries and the effects of their dissolution; there is a very evident nostalgia for monasticism in all the early proposals



for the foundation of women's colleges from Clement Barkside to Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. Lady Stenton stresses the depressing influences of Protestant preaching and homilies, but here again practice conflicted with theory. The individual study of the Bible was a great incentive to women's education and lay patronage exercised directly or indirectly by women of character gave opportunities for the exertion of effective influence. In the same way the Evangelical revival, however unsympathetic in theory to women's emancipation, was in fact to open fresh spheres of activity in philanthropic and social work. The author's chapter on the effects of the Renaissance and Reformation is perhaps the least satisfactory of any, in part because of her uncritical use of the term 'Puritan' to cover women as different as the learned daughters of Sir Anthony Cook on the one hand and the female preachers of the Interregnum on the other. It would be easy to give other instances from the second half of the book which reveal that the author is less familiar with the atmosphere of the later periods, her instinctive touch less sure. But it would be unreasonable to press such criticisms too far for the task which Lady Stenton has set herself bristles with difficulties; they have been squarely faced if not always successfully overcome.

It is one of the great merits of the work that it is based almost exclusively upon contemporary evidence and that generous examples and quotations allow the reader to appreciate the character of the sources used. For the early chapters every chance straw must be collected if any bricks are to be made; for any period after the sixteenth century the mass of evidence is overwhelming. It begins to differ not only in quantity but in kind. Laws, charters, wills, court rolls and other legal records supply the bulk of the medieval material. The value of legal evidence is by no means diminished in the Tudor and Stuart period, but it can be supplemented, and is apt to be too completely superseded by records of a more personal kind, such as letters, diaries, memoirs and the like. These are again augmented and sometimes overshadowed from the latter years of the seventeenth century onwards by an increasing volume of evidence written by women and about women, making it possible as the centuries proceed not only to know more of the actual status of women, but more of what they themselves were thinking about it, or what at any rate certain outstanding and critical women were thinking about it. In this way the materials themselves to some extent dictate the pattern of the work, which begins with an analysis of the legal and social position of women in general, but tends as time goes on to concentrate attention more upon talented individuals, pioneer scholars, reformers and rebels against the subjection of their sex. There is an inevitable tendency for what began as a history of women to end as a history of feminism.

This tendency is encouraged by the author's selection of later materials. Within the field of her own special studies she can draw upon a very wide experience of general medieval sources. For the later periods she has necessarily set out to look for evidence relating specifically to women, and one must pause to admire the wholly delightful collection of minor classics she has rescued from obscurity. But to attach too much weight to material of this nature may well be to emphasize the exceptional rather than the typical, the ideal rather than the actual. What seems to be needed to balance the medieval section is a wider use of the kind of record materials so skilfully drawn upon in the earlier period. The seventeenth-century court rolls of the

manor of Sonning have indeed been quoted to illustrate the position of country women, but little use has been made of legal records in print. Untold wealth awaits exploitation in the unpublished records of the central courts, particularly in the vernacular depositions of the prerogative courts which supply exactly the kind of evidence that is wanted. It would be unreasonable to expect that extensive use could be made of such materials in a survey of this kind; but it is to be hoped that someone will be stimulated by Lady Stenton's example to base a detailed study of a limited period upon these sources. It is not unreasonable to compare Lady Stenton's work on the seventeenth century with Professor Notestein's recent essay on *The English Woman 1580-1650* (in *Studies in Social History: a Tribute to Trevelyan*, 1955). Here is another by-product of mature scholarship. His modest but penetrating study of the position of women in seventeenth-century society rests upon surer foundations because it is the result not of a particular quest, but of a long and intimate acquaintance with the historical materials for the history of the period as a whole. This is simply another way of saying that women are most happily considered as part and parcel of the society of their time. It may be noted in passing that Professor Notestein does not hesitate to make excellent use of contemporary plays which, by one of her many self-denying ordinances, Lady Stenton has excluded from consideration.

EVANGELINE DE VILLIERS

In the Gifford lectures for 1955, HISTORY AND ESCHATOLOGY (Edinburgh University Press. 1957. 171 pp. 15s.), Rudolf Bultmann discusses in a religious context what are usually called philosophies of history, amongst which he finds that of Collingwood the most congenial.

Miss Joan C. Lancaster has compiled for the sixth Anglo-American Conference of Historians a BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HISTORICAL WORKS ISSUED IN THE UNITED KINGDOM 1946-1956 (University of London: Institute of Historical Research. 1957. 388 pp. 25s.). She is to be congratulated on the comprehensiveness, accuracy and skilful classifying of her material. With 7382 separate entries, and an index of authors and publishing societies running to 74 pages in double columns, the task must have been a formidable one, but the resulting bibliography will be of much value to both historians and librarians.

T. K. Derry's SHORT HISTORY OF NORWAY (London: Allen and Unwin. 1957. 281 pp. 25s.) is a sound work based on the findings of modern Norwegian historians. Half the space is fittingly devoted to Norway's history since 1814. The author's sense of proportion, lively narrative and constant awareness of wider issues make the book, despite its brevity, much more than a mere chronicle.

INTERIORS, by Margaret and Alexander Potter (London: John Murray. 1957. 48 pp. 15s.) casts a witty and interesting glance at the development of interior design and furniture in the English home from medieval times to the present day. Technically accurate and illustrated with clever line drawings, it requires a knowledge of carpentry and suffers from excessive compression, but forms a stimulating introduction to the subject.

## OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

- Levi Fox: *COVENTRY'S HERITAGE*. Coventry Evening Telegraph. 1957. 2nd Ed. Illus. + maps. 210 pp. 8s. 6d.
- Alexander, Field Marshal the Rt. Hon. the Earl: *THE BATTLE OF TUNIS*. Basil Hicks Lecture. University of Sheffield. Sheffield: J. W. Northend. 1957. 28 pp. 3s. 6d.
- Olive Hitchcock (ed.): *A HISTORY OF C.M.S. LADIES COLLEGE, COLOMBO 1900-1955*. Colombo: Saman Press. 1957. xi + 115 pp.
- THE CITY OF GOD, St. Augustine: Introduction by Sir Ernest Barker. New ed.: Everyman Library, Nos. 982-3. London: Dent. 1957. 2 vols. 444 pp. and 371 pp. 8s. 6d. each vol.
- Karl Marx: *CAPITAL*. Trans. E. and C. Paul. Introduction by G. D. H. Cole. New ed. Everyman Library, Nos. 848-9. London: Dent. 1957. 2 vols. 584 and 929 pp. 8s. 6d. each vol.
- Erwin Hölzle: *LENIN 1917*. Munich: Oldenbourg-Janus-Bücher. 1957. 96 pp. DM. 3.20.
- H. R. Trevor-Roper: *HISTORY, PROFESSIONAL AND LAY, AN INAUGURAL LECTURE*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1957. 23 pp. 2s. 6d.
- Raymond Lister: *THE LOYAL BLACKSMITH*. Cambridge: The Golden Head Press. 1957. 32 pp. 30s.
- R. Demoulin: *RAPPORT SUR UNE MISSION D'INFORMATION EN ANGLETERRE RELATIVE AUX DOCUMENTS DE LA WILHELMSTRASSE*. Brussels: Bulletin de la Commission Royale d'Histoire. 1957. vol. cxxii. pp. xli-lvii.
- D. L. Dowd: *NAPOLEON: WAS HE THE HEIR OF THE REVOLUTION?* (Source problems of World Civilization). New York: Rinehart and Co. 1957. 60 pp. 75c.
- Derk Bodde: *CHINA'S CULTURAL TRADITION* (Source problems of World Civilization). New York: Rinehart and Co. 1957. 90 pp. \$1.25.
- Ronald Knox: *LET DONS DELIGHT*. London: Sheed and Ward. 1958. 280 pp. 12s. 6d.
- G. F. Kennan: *RUSSIA, THE ATOM AND THE WEST* (B.B.C. Reith Lectures 1957). London: O.U.P. 1958. 120 pp. 10s. 6d.
- Miriam Camps: *THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET AND FREE TRADE AREA* (a Progress Report). Princeton University: Centre of International Studies. 1957. 27 pp.
- Roque Faróane: *LA DECLARACIÓN DE INDEPENDENCIA DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS Y LA DECLARACIÓN DE LOS DERECHOS DEL HOMBRE Y DEL CIUDADANO*. Bilingual edition. Montevideo: Universidad de la Republica. 1957. 31 pp.
- IRISH UNIVERSITY HISTORY STUDENTS CONGRESS BULLETIN, No. 3. Cork, February 1958. 52 pp. 1s.
- Clive Sansom: *THE CATHEDRAL*. London: Methuen. 1958. 118 pp. 10s. 6d.
- J. K. Fairbank: *CHINESE THOUGHT AND INSTITUTIONS*. University of Chicago Press: C.U.P. 1958. 438 pp. 64s.
- K. A. Wittfogel: *ORIENTAL DESPOTISM: STUDY OF TOTAL POWER*. Yale University Press: O.U.P. 1957. xix + 556 pp.
- John Calvin: *ON THE CHRISTIAN FAITH*. Selections from the Institutes, Commentaries and Tracts. New York: Liberal Arts Press. 1957. xxxiii + 219 pp. 95 cents.
- PUBLIC ARCHIVES OF CANADA: MANUSCRIPT DIVISION: PRELIMINARY INVENTORY. Record Groups 14, 15, 16. Parliament, interior and national revenue. Ottawa: Cloutier. 1957. 30 pp. 30 cents.
- R. Pryce: *THE ITALIAN LOCAL ELECTIONS 1956*. St. Antony's Papers. No. 3. London: Chatto and Windus. 1957. 132 pp. 12s. 6d.
- C. V. Wedgewood: *THE COMMON MAN IN THE CIVIL WAR*. Leicester University Press. 1957. 23 pp. 3s.
- J. S. Taylor: *TWO ESSAYS ON OLD THORNE*. T. A. Tate, Market Place, Thorne, Yorks. 1957. 22 pp.
- A. R. Hewitt: *GUIDE TO RESOURCES FOR COMMONWEALTH STUDIES IN LONDON, OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE*. London: Athlone Press. 1957. viii + 219 pp. 21s.
- C. P. McVicker: *TITOISM—PATTERN FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM*. London: Macmillan. 1957. xx + 332 pp. 36s.
- Michael Grant (ed.): *ROMAN READINGS*. London: Penguin, 1958. 464 pp. 5s.



- Nietzsche: *THUS SPAKE ZARATHUSTRA*. Introduction by Roy Pascal. London: Dent. Everyman's Library. 1958. xxxiii + 288 pp. 8s. 6d.
- Boswell: *THE JOURNAL OF A TOUR TO THE HEBRIDES*. Introduction by L. F. Powell. London: Dent. Everyman's Library. 1958. ix + 322 pp. 8s. 6d.
- J. W. Coulter: *THE PACIFIC DEPENDENCIES OF THE UNITED STATES*. New York and London: Macmillan. 1957. 388 pp. 47s.
- T. B. Costain: *THE WHITE AND THE GOLD: THE FRENCH RÉGIME IN CANADA*. London: Collins. 1957. 482 pp. 30s.
- F. Gognel and G. Zieburg: *DAS FRANZÖSISCHE REGIERUNGSSYSTEM*. Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag. 1956-7. 2 vols. 107 and 185 pp. DM. 11.50.
- A. Mueller-Deham: *HUMAN RELATIONS AND POWER*. New York: Philosophical Library. 1957. xxi + 410 pp. \$3.75.
- J. McIntyre: *THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF HISTORY*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 1957. 119 pp. 12s. 6d.
- ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK. 1807-1957. London: A. and C. Black. 1957. 115 pp. 10s. 6d.
- W. v. d. Steinen: *CANOSSA*. Munich: R. Oldenbourg. 1957. 96 pp. DM. 3.20.
- STUDI IN ONORE DI ANTONIO GENOVESI NEL BICENTENARIO DELLA ISTITUZIONE DELLA CATTEDRA DI ECONOMIA. Ed. Domenico Demario. Naples: L'Arte Tipografica. 1956. xvi + 346 pp.
- Domenico Demario: *QUELLO CHE È VIVO DEL PENSIERO ECONOMICO DI ANTONIO GENOVESI*. Naples: L'Arte Tipografica. 1957. 34 pp.
- Pedro Loeffling: *PLANTAE AMERICANAE*. Madrid: Insula. 1957. 127 pp.
- John Gilissen: *LE RÉGIME REPRESENTATIF EN BELGIQUE DEPUIS 1790*. Brussels: La Renaissance du livre. 1957. 197 pp.

---

# EDWARD III

## AND THE KINGDOM OF FRANCE<sup>1</sup>

---

JOHN LE PATOUREL

*University of Leeds*

WHILE THE CAUSES of the Hundred Years War have given rise to a great deal of discussion, the war aims of the kings of England and France have generally been taken for granted rather than discussed.<sup>2</sup> It has been too easily assumed that the deeper causes of the conflict, whatever they were, determined the objectives of the contestants; and, since it now seems to be agreed that the problems of Aquitaine in some way lay at the root of the trouble,<sup>3</sup> it is argued that Edward's aim was no more than the defence of his duchy, if necessary by enlarging it or at least recovering its ancient limits, and that his claim to the throne of France was rather a tactical device, never taken really seriously, and easily thrown over for territorial concessions.<sup>4</sup> In this paper it will be argued, first, that Edward's claim to the throne of France was meant more seriously and deserves to be taken more seriously than it has been by historians during the present century, both as to its merits and as to its place in his war aims; and second, that his chances—and indeed his achievement—up to the winter of 1359–60 were a great deal better than they are generally reckoned to have been.

### I

In any discussion of the French succession problems of the early fourteenth century, the fundamental consideration is that the situations of 1316 and 1328 were without precedent.<sup>5</sup> A monarchy which had been

<sup>1</sup> This paper represents, not a mature statement of conclusions, but an airing of ideas, substantially as they were presented at a Director's Conference in the Institute of Historical Research (November 1957). I am indebted to my audience on that occasion for the discussion that followed, and to Dr. Pierre Chaplais who has read and criticized the typescript.

<sup>2</sup> For a convenient discussion of the origins of the war, see G. Templeman, 'Edward III and the Beginnings of the Hundred Years War', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, II (1952), pp. 69–88; cf. Ph. Wolff, 'Un problème d'origines: La Guerre de Cent Ans', *Eventail de l'histoire vivante: homage à Lucien Febvre*, II (1953), pp. 141–8.

<sup>3</sup> E. Déprez, *Les Préliminaires de la guerre de Cent Ans*, 1902. Cf. E. Perroy, *The Hundred Years War* (trans. W. B. Wells, 1951), p. 69, and the same writer's valuable article 'Franco-English Relations, 1350–1400', *History*, XXI (1936–7), pp. 148–54.

<sup>4</sup> Perroy, *op. cit.*, pp. 69, 116, 129, 139; Templeman, p. 87.

<sup>5</sup> P. Viollet, 'Comment les femmes ont été exclues en France de la succession à la couronne', *Mémoires de l'Institut, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, XXXIV (1895), ii, pp. 125–78,

more elective than hereditary in the tenth century had become unquestionably hereditary in the fourteenth; but it had become so not by enactment or by a series of disputes leading to clear decisions, but by the fact of a continuous succession from father to son, uninterrupted through three centuries. There was therefore no rule to which appeal could be made when, as in 1316, the king's only son was a posthumous infant who died within a few days of his birth or, as in 1328, when the king left no son to succeed him. Every question was wide open. Had the royal succession a rule of its own, or could analogies be adduced from neighbouring kingdoms, from royal appanages in France, from the great fiefs, from manors in the Ile de France?<sup>6</sup> Could females succeed in default of males, or, if they could not succeed in person, could they transmit their rights to their own heirs? All these points were argued over and again; and perhaps all that can be said on the question of absolute right is that no word was breathed in 1328 of a Salic Law and that analogy, for what it might be worth, on the whole told in favour of female rights in the succession. Indeed, as recently as 1314, when the future Philip V had applied to his brother King Louis X for a ruling on the succession to his appanage of Poitou, the king had said, 'Reason and natural law instruct us that in default of male heirs females should inherit and have succession to the goods and possessions of the fathers of whom they are procreated and descended in legal marriage, in the same way as males.'<sup>7</sup>

The issue of 1316 was decided, not by discussion, but by the ambition and ruthlessness of the man who became Philip V; and the opposition he had to face, interested though it may have been, is testimony to the strength of the feeling that women had a place in the succession, just as the many bargains which he struck implicitly recognized their rights. No serious objection seems to have been raised, in 1322, when his brother Charles thrust aside Philip's daughters; but in 1328, the fact that Philip VI allowed Jeanne, daughter of Louis X, to succeed to Navarre, and made generous compensation for Champagne, shows that the possibility of a queen regnant cannot have been entirely ignored.

Now it is certainly true that, in a general sense, 'le fait crée le droit'; but in 1328 there were only two precedents for the exclusion of women, they were recent and they did not entirely meet the case. In view of the general feeling in favour of women's rights to succeed (to property certainly, though not necessarily to the functions of monarchy) there

for the most part reproduced in the same writer's *Histoire des Institutions politiques et administratives de la France*, II (1898), pp. 52-86. Cf. Déprez, *Préliminaires*, chs. II, VI; J. Viard, 'Philippe VI de Valois, la succession au trône', *Moyen Age*, XXXII (1921), pp. 218-22; J. M. Potter, 'The Development and Significance of the Salic Law of the French', *English Historical Review*, LII (1937), pp. 235-53.

<sup>6</sup> The general uncertainty is well shown by the judgements given in the king's court on succession problems in the great fiefs during the fourteenth century: see the editor's notes in *The Chronicle of Jean de Venette*, ed. R. A. Newhall (1953), pp. 151-3, 160-1, and authorities there cited.

<sup>7</sup> Quoted by Potter, *op. cit.*, p. 237; Viollet, p. 58.



was still room for argument, particularly on Edward's thesis that, even though his mother might not be able to succeed, she could transmit her rights to him and that, through her, he was in fact the nearest male heir to the late King Charles IV. What we know of the discussion in the great assembly which met in Paris during the spring of 1328 shows that there was some substance in this argument. Edward, as duke of Aquitaine and peer of France, was rightly represented there, and well represented it would seem, for, according to one manuscript of the *Grandes Chroniques*, his proctors convinced some of the doctors of civil and canon law of the validity of his argument.<sup>8</sup> If this is so, then Edward already had some support in France.

There is no need to bring in considerations of national feeling, which may or may not have existed at the time, in order to explain the final decision. It is true that the chronicler known as the First Continuator of Nangis states that some French barons said openly that they could not contemplate subjection to English rule with equanimity;<sup>9</sup> but before building too much on that remark, we must remember that it applies to the year 1328, when a decision in favour of Edward would have meant the rule of Isabella and Mortimer in France, a prospect which it might well have been difficult for the French to face with equanimity. Edward, after all, was no alien in France. His ancestry was as 'French' as Philip's; he was duke of Aquitaine, count of Ponthieu and a peer of France; he spoke French; and the case of Navarre provided a good and recent precedent for the rule of two kingdoms by one king. More revealing, perhaps, is the remark preserved in the *Chronographia*,<sup>10</sup> that Philip of Valois was preferred to Philip of Evreux (another possible candidate) because he was of more mature age. Philip of Valois was in fact 35 at the time, and Philip of Evreux 23; but Edward was still only 15 and in no sense his own master. There were thus good and practical reasons for preferring Philip of Valois to Edward, in 1328; and Philip was regent, well thought of and presumably in command of the situation. But while such considerations may explain what actually happened, they do nothing to weaken the merits of Edward's claim.

It was, indeed, opposed not by a rule of law but by a *fait accompli* or, perhaps one should say, by a short series of *faits accomplis*—unless it be argued, in face of the evidence, that the throne of France could be regarded as elective in the fourteenth century. Since, in the abstract, there was much to be said for it, there was no reason why Edward should not believe in his cause; and if the circumstances of the first ten years of his reign in England made it impossible for him to do much more than state his claim at that time<sup>11</sup> (and circumstances, indeed, had forced him to do homage for Aquitaine, an act which was taken to imply, and

<sup>8</sup> *Grandes Chroniques* (ed. J. Viard), IX (1937), pp. 72-3, note 2. Cf. *Chronique latine de Guillaume de Nangis . . . avec les continuations* (ed. H. Géraud), II (1843), pp. 82-4.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 83.

<sup>10</sup> *Chronographia regum francorum* (ed. H. Moranville), I (1891), p. 292.

<sup>11</sup> But the claim was formally made in 1328, and some attempt to apply military pressure: Déprez, *Préliminaires*, pp. 35-6; *Fœdera* (Rec. Comm.), II, pp. 736-7, 743, 744, 749, 750-1.

was intended by the French to imply, a renunciation of his claim to the throne of France, though he was still under age and in no position to resist the demand for homage), it was not unnatural that he should take it up again when circumstances were more favourable. Indeed, if the claim meant anything to him he had no choice, for an inherited right implied a duty. Authority came from God. Edward made this point very clear in his manifestos of 1340:

Whereas the kingdom of France has fallen to us by most clear right, by divine disposition and through the death of Charles of famous memory, late king of France, . . . and the lord Philip of Valois . . . intruded himself into the said kingdom by violence while we were still of tender years and occupies it in defiance of God and of justice; we, lest we should seem to neglect our right and the gift of celestial grace, or appear unwilling to put our will into conformity with divine pleasure, have put forward our claim to the said kingdom in due form and, trusting in the support of the heavenly kingdom, have undertaken the government of it, *as we ought to do*.<sup>12</sup>

This is too easily dismissed as common form or fine phrases. It rings true.

Considerations of this sort tend to establish Edward's good faith in his claim to the throne of France; they do not, by themselves, establish the point that the throne was his real war aim. This, perhaps, can best be argued from his military and political strategy, and from the whole manner in which he fought his war; but first it is necessary to consider the opposing thesis—that the claim and his assumption of the French royal title were simply a manoeuvre and that his real objective was a secure and sovereign Aquitaine.

On the face of it, the war, up to 1360, does not look like a war in defence of Aquitaine. The campaigning started in the north-east of France and then moved to Brittany; only after six years or so was there any military activity of any consequence in the south. Although such a thing is difficult to measure quantitatively, it is perhaps reasonable to say that the greater part of Edward's military activity, until 1369, was in the north; and he himself led no campaign beyond the Loire. If all this activity in the north was a diversion, it was a very big diversion—too big to believe in, for it seems far-fetched to speak of defending Aquitaine on the moors of Brittany or the plain of Flanders.

More specifically, however, it is argued that Edward's real objective could not have been the throne of France because he showed himself ready, on more than one occasion, to abandon his claim in return for territorial concessions—in fact, for a sovereign Aquitaine. This argument needs closer examination. The incidents quoted in support of it are the discussions at Avignon in 1344, the negotiations leading to and

<sup>12</sup> *Fœdera*, II, pp. 1108–9; quoted by Avesbury (*De gestis mirabilibus*, ed. E. Maunde Thompson, R.S., 1889), pp. 309–10.

developing out of the draft treaty of Guines in 1354, and the ratification of the treaty of Brétigny in 1360.<sup>13</sup>

The discussions at Avignon during the autumn of 1344 are known to us in some detail owing to the survival of letters sent back by the English envoys and a journal written by one of them.<sup>14</sup> From these documents it is clear that they began by stating Edward's claim to the throne of France without qualification, that they returned to it again and again, and that although they could be persuaded to put it aside, as it were, in order to discuss other proposals that might tend towards a peace, they never retreated from their position that their king's demand was for the kingdom of France, as his right. It was the French delegates who insisted that the origins of the war lay in Aquitaine, and that the way to a settlement lay through a discussion of disputes arising in the duchy.

The treaty of Guines was drawn up in the spring of 1354.<sup>15</sup> According to the text printed by Bock, it would have given Aquitaine, the Loire provinces, Ponthieu and Calais to Edward, all in full sovereignty, in return for his renunciation of the throne of France. There is no mention of Brittany where Edward's forces and those of his Breton allies were well established. Final renunciations and ratifications were to be made at Avignon. A meeting duly took place there in the autumn, but no treaty was made. There is no direct evidence to show which side was responsible for this breakdown; most English chroniclers blame the French, but Knighton, whose information may ultimately have come from Henry of Lancaster, the leader of the English delegation, says that Lancaster refused specifically to give up Edward's claim and title to the kingdom of France.<sup>16</sup> Such a stand would have wrecked the treaty at once; and if he was at the same time negotiating with Charles of Navarre for a joint conquest and partition of France,<sup>17</sup> as he seems to have been, it may be that he came to Avignon with no intention of ratifying.<sup>18</sup>

However, the treaty of Brétigny does seem at first sight to destroy the argument, for here is a treaty in which Edward unquestionably renounced the throne of France in return for territory—an enlarged Aquitaine, Ponthieu, Calais and the county of Guines, all in full sovereignty. But, to divine Edward's intentions, the treaty must be

<sup>13</sup> Perroy, *Hundred Years War*, pp. 116, 129, 139.

<sup>14</sup> Froissart, *Chroniques*, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, XVIII (1874), pp. 202–56; E. Déprez, 'La Conférence d'Avignon (1344)', *Essays in Medieval History presented to Thomas Frederick Tout* (ed. A. G. Little and F. M. Powicke), 1925, pp. 301–320.

<sup>15</sup> G. Mollat, 'Innocent VI et les tentatives de paix entre la France et l'Angleterre (1353–55)', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, X (1909), pp. 729–43; F. Bock, 'Some new Documents illustrating the early years of the Hundred Years War (1353–1356)', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XV (1931), pp. 60–99.

<sup>16</sup> *Chronicon Henrici Knighton* (ed. J. R. Lumby, R.S.), II (1895), p. 78. But this part of the chronicle may have been written many years after the event, see V. H. Galbraith, 'The Chronicle of Henry Knighton', Fritz Saxl, 1890–1948, *A Volume of Memorial Essays* . . . (1957), pp. 136–48.

<sup>17</sup> R. Delachenal, 'Premières négociations de Charles le Mauvais avec les Anglais (1354–1355)', *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, LXI (1900), pp. 253–82.

<sup>18</sup> But see the secret instruction printed by Bock, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, XV, pp. 94–6.



considered in relation to the earlier drafts of 1358 and 1359 and the ratification at Calais in October 1360. The text of the first draft, which Delachenal discovered and which he called the 'First Treaty of London', would have given to Edward all that the treaty of 1360 gave him, together with suzerainty over Brittany.<sup>19</sup> Neither he nor other commentators seem to have noticed, however, that it demanded nothing whatever from Edward in return. The French territorial concessions would have been part of the price to be paid for King John's conditional release; nothing more. The second draft, produced rather more than a year later, in March 1359 ('the Second Treaty of London'),<sup>20</sup> demanded far greater territorial concessions from France, the whole of the old Angevin Empire, together with the counties of Ponthieu, Boulogne and Guines, and the town of Calais, all in full sovereignty and completely detached from the kingdom of France; but this time Edward promised to renounce his claim. However, if the seemingly casual way in which this promise is made is compared with the elaborate securities demanded of the king of France for the performance of his part in the treaty, and if one tries to visualize what France would have been like (shorn of all her western and northern provinces) if the treaty had been carried into effect, it is difficult to believe that it represents a sincere proposal for peace on Edward's part or, if it does, then his price for a promise to renounce the claim—a promise unsupported by any security—was the kingdom virtually delivered into his hands. This is how it must have seemed to the French Estates when, with superb courage, they rejected the treaty as 'ni passable ni faisable'.

If, a year later, Edward was prepared to give up his claim and his title for considerably less territory,<sup>21</sup> this was due to the overwhelming defeat he had suffered in the winter of 1359–60. The great campaign which was to have brought him to a coronation in Reims Cathedral petered out in the suburbs of Paris. Even so, the renunciation that he undertook to make was never actually made. French historians have seen in the detachment of the renunciation clauses from the ratification of the treaty at Calais, and their embodiment in a separate document to be put into force at a later date, a great victory for French diplomacy.<sup>22</sup> It may have been so. But the evidence which Dr. Chaplais has now put together suggests that it was Edward, not King John of France, who defaulted on the renunciations;<sup>23</sup> and if that is so, we may ask

<sup>19</sup> R. Delachenal, *Histoire de Charles V*, II (1927), pp. 59–77, 402–11.

<sup>20</sup> Text in E. Cosneau, *Les grands traités de la Guerre de Cent Ans* (1889), pp. 1–32. Cf. Delachenal, *op. cit.*, pp. 77–88.

<sup>21</sup> Texts of the treaties of Brétigny and Calais with subsidiary documents are printed in *Fœdera*, III, pp. 485–547. They are most conveniently studied in Cosneau, *op. cit.*, pp. 33–68, 173–4.

<sup>22</sup> Petit-Dutaillis and Collier, 'La diplomatie française et le traité de Brétigny', *Moyen Age*, X (1897), pp. 1–35; E. Perroy, 'Charles V et le traité de Brétigny', *ibid.*, XXXVIII (1928), pp. 255–81.

<sup>23</sup> P. Chaplais, 'Some Documents regarding the Fulfilment and Interpretation of the Treaty of Brétigny, 1361–1369', *Camden Miscellany*, XIX (1952), p. 7.

whether, having brought his army safely home in the summer, he no longer felt that the military situation was quite so desperate in October 1360 as it had appeared to those negotiating on his behalf in May. Had he given away more than he had any need to do?

It is difficult to be sure that Edward would never have renounced the title, short of military necessity, for a 'good peace'; but in fact no peace ever was good enough. Though he gave up the use of the French title for nine years, he never actually renounced the claim. The burden of proof still lies with those who maintain that Edward's aim was anything less than the throne of France.

## II

Edward III was no fool. If he had really made the throne of France his war-aim, he must have felt that he had some chance of success. It is possible that recent historians have played down the dynastic issue, which a French writer has dismissed as 'preposterous',<sup>24</sup> because it seemed to them that Edward had no chance whatever of making himself effectively king of France, and therefore his real aim must have been something different. Now that the evidence can be seen to support the seriousness of Edward's claim, his chances must be re-examined.

In part, clearly, this is a matter of military organization. A good deal is now known about the organization of the English armies at this time,<sup>25</sup> but it is still difficult to compare it in detail with the French.<sup>26</sup> In part, similarly, it is a matter of personalities. England was favoured in the 'forties and the 'fifties with a rare constellation of military leaders, from the king himself, the Black Prince, and great nobles like Lancaster and Northampton, to men of much humbler origin such as Thomas Dagworth, Walter Mauny and Walter Bentley. No one can say, as yet, whether the presence of so much ability was a lucky chance, or whether there was something in the system that enabled the talent available to be used to the best advantage; and it would be good to know, more specifically than we do at present, how military and political policy was worked out and who was responsible. These questions become all the more interesting when it begins to appear that Edward's campaigns were not simply a matter of sending an army to France to look for a battle. There appears to be a pattern in these campaigns—perhaps it would be too much to call it a 'higher strategy'—a pattern that was closely related to political conditions.

The starting-point in this discussion must be Edward's assumption of the title 'King of France' at Ghent, on 26 January 1340. This was no

<sup>24</sup> Perroy, 'Franco-English Relations, 1350-1400', *History*, XXI (1936-7), p. 154.

<sup>25</sup> A. E. Prince, 'The Army and the Navy', in *The English Government at Work, 1327-1337*, ed. J. F. Willard and W. A. Morris, I (1940), pp. 332-76, and works cited there; N. B. Lewis, 'The Organisation of Indentured Retinues in Fourteenth-Century England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th Series, XXVII (1945), pp. 29-39 etc.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. F. Lot and R. Fawtier, *Histoire des Institutions françaises au Moyen Age*, II, *Institutions royales* (1958), pp. 511-35.

impulsive and ill-considered act. The idea that Edward should assume the title is known to have been suggested by a deputation from Bruges as far back as 1328.<sup>27</sup> He actually used it in letters patent dated 7 October 1337;<sup>28</sup> and although its use on this occasion seems to have been for one particular purpose only,<sup>29</sup> it implies an intention to assume the title definitively at some suitable moment. The assumption of the French title had been under discussion between Edward and his allies for some months at least before January 1340,<sup>30</sup> and the decision must have been taken well before the date of the ceremony, for the new seal was used on that day.<sup>31</sup> Was it merely a coincidence that the ceremony took place so near to the anniversary of Edward's accession to the throne of England that his regnal years could be dated from the same day in both countries?<sup>32</sup> Moreover, as Jean le Bel pointed out,<sup>33</sup> Edward must have expected a great deal from this act if he was prepared to face the ridicule that would fall upon a ruler who called himself king of a country that he did not possess. It is quite possible that Edward's need for an alliance with Flanders provided the occasion; but the assumption of the French title could solve so many problems<sup>34</sup> that it is hard to believe that no considerations other than those directly affecting the Flemings were taken into account.

That much wider possibilities were in fact taken into consideration is shown by Edward's letters of reassurance to the people of Gascony<sup>35</sup> and the people of England,<sup>36</sup> and still more by the manifesto which he addressed to the people of France.<sup>37</sup> This last is a most important document which has not received the attention it deserves. It begins by stating the basis of Edward's claim and accuses Philip VI of usurping the kingdom of France while Edward was under age 'against God and against justice'. After long and mature deliberation, Edward had undertaken the government of the kingdom and had assumed the title, as he was in duty bound to do. It was not his intention to deprive the people of France of their rights; on the contrary, he was resolved to do justice to all 'and to re-establish the good laws and customs that were in force in the time of his progenitor St. Louis'. Nor was it his intention to seek his own gain at their expense, by variations in the currency or by un-

<sup>27</sup> H. Pirenne, *Histoire de Belgique*, II (4th ed. 1947), pp. 94-5.

<sup>28</sup> *Fœdera*, II, pp. 1000, 1001.

<sup>29</sup> Letters were issued on the same day without the French title (P.R.O., Treaty Roll 11, m. 2).

<sup>30</sup> H. S. Lucas, *The Low Countries and the Hundred Years' War, 1326-1347*, pp. 358 ff.

<sup>31</sup> *Fœdera*, II, p. 1107; letter dated 'apud Gandavum, xxvi die Januarii, anno regni nostri Francie primo, Angliae vero quartodecimo'. This formula would not have been compatible with the old seal.

<sup>32</sup> A matter of considerable convenience: compare the complexities in the regnal years of Philip and Mary.

<sup>33</sup> *Chronique de Jean le Bel* (ed. J. Viard and E. Déprez), I (1904), pp. 167-8.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. the letter of summons addressed to the archbishop of Canterbury, 21 February 1340 (*Fœdera*, II, p. 1115): 'Non mirantes ex hoc quod stilum nostrum consuetum mutavimus, & Regem Francie nos facimus nominari; nam diversae subsunt causae, per quas hoc facere necessario nos oportet.'

<sup>35</sup> *Fœdera*, II, p. 1127.

<sup>36</sup> Froissart, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, XVIII, pp. 129-30.

<sup>37</sup> *Fœdera*, II, pp. 1108-9, 1111.



lawful exactions and maltolts because, he thanked God, he had enough to support his estate and his honour; indeed, he hoped to ease their burdens and to maintain the liberties and privileges of everyone, especially those of Holy Church. In all matters affecting the kingdom of France he would seek the counsel of peers, prelates, nobles and other *sapientes* who were faithful to him; and he would never act capriciously or arbitrarily. All men of the kingdom of France who should recognize him as their lord and king before Easter following (as the people of Flanders had already rightly done) would be received into his especial peace and protection and would continue to enjoy their property undisturbed. The manifesto was ordered to be affixed to church doors so that all might take notice.

No doubt historians have taken little notice of this document because it seems, at first sight, so commonplace, the sort of appeal that any invader might put out. But in fact it is very carefully drafted. Whoever composed it knew a great deal about the history of France during the previous fifty years or so, for point by point it meets the grievances of the politically effective (or at any rate politically articulate) French against their government, as these were expressed, for example, in the provincial charters of 1314-15—taxation which was held to exceed the bounds of legality and which was regarded as an attack upon the rights, property and privileges of churches, nobility and townsmen: debase-ment of the currency: arbitrary acts of kings and their officials.<sup>38</sup> Edward does not merely denounce these evils; he offers himself as a 'constitutional' king, prepared to act always with the counsel of magnates and learned men; above all he undertakes (this is a direct echo of nearly all the provincial charters) to return to the customs 'of the time of the good St. Louis', that is, to the time when, as it was generally thought, these objectionable practices were as yet not prevalent.

What this really amounted to is that Edward might represent what we should call 'an alternative government', with a readily comprehensible political programme which was all the more telling because, though there had been opposition to royal centralization in France since the beginning of the century, it had so far failed to find effective political expression. Henceforward, however, any Frenchman who might find it convenient or profitable to change his allegiance, or who might be driven to it; anyone who might come to feel, as the result of defeats or disasters, that the Valois succession had not been blessed by God; all who were alienated by those arbitrary acts of cruelty and violence to which the early Valois kings were occasionally prone (such as the execution of the Breton seigneurs in 1343, of the count of Eu and Guines in 1350 and of the friends of Charles of Navarre in 1336)—all such could look for protection and comfort to one who was already acknowledged as the rightful king of France in Flanders (and presumably in Aquitaine)

<sup>38</sup> On the provincial charters, see A. Artonne, *Le mouvement de 1314 et les chartes provinciales de 1315* (1912).

and who had solemnly taken the title and assumed the responsibility of government; and they were provided with a legal pretext for so doing.

That there must have been some such calculation in the minds of Edward and his advisers, however vaguely, is shown by what followed. The leagues of 1314-15, and the provincial charters they produced, were the work of the nobility of the second order, not the dukes of Brittany or Burgundy or their peers, but nobility of provincial importance. This was shown clearly in Artois where the leaguers were as much concerned with the oppressions of the officers of the Countess as with the aggressions of the king's officers; and the really significant thing about these leagues is the most immediately obvious. In contrast to baronial movements in England during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, they were organized on a provincial basis and their aim was a charter of provincial liberties. This by itself shows that national consciousness, if indeed it existed in early fourteenth-century France, was still a very tender plant; and Edward, if he were prepared to conduct the conquest of France province by province, while not neglecting more traditional methods altogether, was provided with a fine opportunity which, as duke of Aquitaine, he should know how to exploit. His action in Normandy, during the years 1356-1360, offers a very good example.

The duchy, though incorporated into the royal domain after 1204, had preserved much of its individuality.<sup>39</sup> Its administration, staffed though it was by royal officers from Paris, remained distinct; nobles and prelates still attended the exchequer of pleas which, though no longer sovereign, continued to administer the custom of Normandy. This distinct legal system, so often described simply as 'the laws and customs of the country'—in practice, the liberties and privileges of individual churches, barons and communities quite as much as details of legal precepts and procedure—gave to the Normans the basis of their 'provincial consciousness'. To the Norman seigneurs and churchmen, the vast development in the activity of royal government during the thirteenth century appeared as a threat to their 'laws and customs', otherwise their properties and liberties. They objected to the practice of encouraging appeals from the exchequer to the parliament, because that endangered the custom; they objected to the methods and indeed to the fact of royal taxation as an assault upon their liberties and property; they objected to the activities of the royal *baillis* who strove continually to exalt royal jurisdiction against private rights of justice. They stood out for traditional feudal decentralization against royal centralization.

These grievances were given an opportunity to express themselves, and thereby to grow and be organized, in the assemblies which the king summoned from time to time to consent to his demands for taxation, particularly since such meetings were often called as assemblies of the duchy. One result was the 'Charte aux Normands' of 1315 which,

<sup>39</sup> A. Coville, *Les États de Normandie* (1894); J. R. Strayer, *The Administration of Normandy under St. Louis* (1932); R. Besnier, *La Coutume de Normandie, Histoire externe* (1935), pp. 70 ff.

because of its background, was a more effective document than any of the other provincial charters of the time. Among other things it restored its sovereignty to the Norman exchequer, thus safeguarding and, as it were, sealing the custom; and it offered some protection against taxation without consent, making it more difficult for the king to raise taxes in Normandy without calling a provincial assembly. The important implication of these concessions is that they made Normandy a distinct, privileged and quasi-political entity. But this did not end the Norman grievances, for the movement of 1314-15, as a whole, hardly affected the development of royal policy; though now, and for some time, the Normans were able to make consent to taxation conditional upon a confirmation of their privileges, and on one occasion the king had to associate himself with an extraordinary scheme for a new 'Norman Conquest of England' to divert their indignation away from himself.<sup>40</sup>

Edward's opportunity to turn all this to his own account came in 1356, when King John surprised a dinner-party that was being held by his son, the duke of Normandy, in Rouen Castle, took Charles of Navarre prisoner and executed four of his associates out of hand.<sup>41</sup> One of these was John, count of Harcourt, who, with his uncle Godfrey of Harcourt and Charles of Navarre himself, was among the leaders of the Norman opposition. Now although there may well have been an element of personal feud in this incident, there can be little doubt that the Norman grievances were at the bottom of it. Already, in 1354, Charles of Navarre had assured Edward that the Norman nobility was behind him to a man;<sup>42</sup> and now Philip of Navarre, Charles's brother, having failed to obtain satisfaction from King John, sent in his *défi* and opened negotiations with Edward. Godfrey of Harcourt did likewise; and both did homage to him as 'King of France and duke of Normandy',<sup>43</sup> for that was the condition which Edward imposed before he would give them assistance. It is easy to see that the simple title 'King of France' would not raise much enthusiasm in Normandy, for the Norman quarrel was with the king of France, his violence and his centralizing policy; but Edward could offer himself to the Normans as their duke, pledged to act in all things 'selon les lois, coutumes et usages du pays'. In the Cotentin, where the barony of St. Sauveur-le-Vicomte was bequeathed to him by Godfrey of Harcourt, he was able to put this principle into practice by appointing officers to the traditional posts of local government with such authority as pertained to their offices 'according to the custom of our duchy of Normandy'.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Coville, *op cit.*, pp. 47-50. A copy of the agreement was found, presumably in the archives of the town, during the sack of Caen in 1346. It was sent back to England and read at Paul's Cross—a superb gift to Edward's war propaganda (Avesbury, *De gestis mirabilibus*, pp. 363-7; cf. Murimuth, *Continuatio Chronicarum*, *ibid.*, pp. 205-12, 257-63).

<sup>41</sup> On this incident, see Delachenal, *Histoire de Charles V*, I, pp. 134-56.

<sup>42</sup> Froissart, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove, XVIII, pp. 354-6. <sup>43</sup> *Federa*, III, pp. 332, 340.

<sup>44</sup> L. Delisle, *Histoire du château et des sires de Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte* (1867). Le Patourel, 'Edouard III "roi de France et duc de Normandie"', 1356-1360', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 4<sup>e</sup> sér., XXXI (1953), pp. 317-18.



It is difficult to measure the degree of support that was given to Edward's cause in Normandy; but after Lancaster's brilliant campaign in the summer of 1356, the co-operation of his forces with those of Philip of Navarre brought English troops to the gates of Paris and even into the city, and established a number of English garrisons in Norman strongholds. Politically, Edward's action gave him recognition as king of France by a group of Norman seigneurs and their followers, which, whether large or small, was important simply because it existed. Edward had a foothold, perhaps more than a foothold, in the strategically vital duchy of Normandy.

Behind the opposition of this provincial nobility, however, there lurked, already in 1340, the beginnings of a still more dangerous reaction to royal centralization in France. The nobles of the front rank, the counts of Flanders, the dukes of Brittany and Burgundy—and the duke of Aquitaine—had been building up the structure of government in their duchies and counties just as the king had been building up the government of his kingdom, sometimes in advance of the king, as in Normandy and Flanders during the twelfth century, sometimes in imitation, as in Brittany and Burgundy during the thirteenth century when both were ruled by dynasties of Capetian origin. Each 'principality' had a *curia* in a more or less advanced state of specialization into *conseil*, *parlement* and *chambre des comptes* (though the names varied from one to another), and each had an organized system of local government. In Flanders the count's *baillis* can be seen pursuing precisely the same policy of disintegrating seigneurial autonomies as the king's *baillis* were pursuing in the kingdom at large; and each of these princes was building up a system of judicial appeals within their territories on the same principles as the king in his kingdom.<sup>45</sup>

Sooner or later the royal and princely governments were bound to clash for both were moving towards the same end. No doubt the princes felt the effects of royal centralization in their pride and in their pockets as much as the nobility of the second rank; but they also resented it as interference in their governments, as a threat to their authority, as a menace that might at any time throw their administration completely out of gear or bring it to a standstill. It is likely that this was felt as strongly by his officials as by duke or count himself—before the end of the century the lawyers were saying, both in Normandy and Brittany, that 'le duché n'est pas du royaume'.<sup>46</sup> Besides, most of the principalities had strong interests in countries outside the kingdom, Flanders in the Empire and in England, Brittany in England, Aquitaine in England and in Spain; and liege homage as it was being interpreted in the fourteenth century made it difficult or impossible

<sup>45</sup> F. Lot and R. Fawtier (ed.), *Histoire des Institutions françaises au Moyen Age*, I, *Institutions seigneuriales* (1957). This volume gives much of the information, but it is not the comparative constitutional history of the great French fiefs which is so much needed.

<sup>46</sup> E. G. Léonard, *Histoire de la Normandie* (1944), p. 69; B. A. Pocquet du Haut-Jussé, *Les papes et les ducs de Bretagne*, I (1928), p. 420.

for the princes to pursue the 'foreign policies' that their interests demanded.

The beginnings of a princely reaction can already be seen before 1340. It can be seen most clearly in Aquitaine, where Edward I had done all that careful organization could do to restrain or prevent appeals in Paris, to anticipate royal legislation and evade royal taxation, to build up a complete provincial government<sup>47</sup> and ultimately to set up a theory of English sovereignty in Gascony over against the French king's sovereignty in his kingdom.<sup>48</sup> The possibility of ducal sovereignty was hardly envisaged as yet in Brittany, where the duke was, in general, a very loyal vassal like his brother of Burgundy at this time; but he too could get it established that there should be no appeals to Paris from his duchy until all the resources of his own hierarchy of courts had been exhausted, and secure acknowledgement that he performed military service of his own free will and not as an obligation.<sup>49</sup> In Flanders the position was vastly complicated by the precocious economic and social—as well as political—development of the county, so that King Philip IV's demands led to what was in effect a war of independence in which England had been involved as far back as the 1290s.

Thus Edward's difficulties in Aquitaine, whatever their place may be in the origins of the war, were by no means peculiar to him. However loyal the princes might be personally, these same difficulties were present in all their duchies and counties to a greater or less degree. If one were to say that the first phase of the Hundred Years War was a civil war, a rebellion of the princes against royal centralization which threatened to reduce them before very long to mere landlords—a rebellion led by the duke of Aquitaine because of his great resources outside the kingdom—it would be an exaggeration of one aspect of the matter, but there would be a good deal of truth in it. There can be no doubt, at least, that the war greatly assisted the process which was raising these duchies and counties into real principalities that were independent *de facto* and all but sovereign *de jure* in the fifteenth century.<sup>50</sup>

However this may be, the situation offered great possibilities to a prince who, having a claim to the throne of France, might think of pursuing it province by province, adjusting his methods to the individual circumstances of each. The traditional alternative of a single decisive

<sup>47</sup> Unpublished theses, P. Chaplais, 'Gascon Appeals to England, 1259-1453' (University of London), and J. P. Trabut-Cussac, 'L'Administration anglaise en Gascogne sous Henri III et Edouard Ier' (École des Chartes); cf. Sir Maurice Powicke, *The Thirteenth Century, 1216-1307* (1953), ch. VII.

<sup>48</sup> P. Chaplais, 'English Arguments concerning the Feudal Status of Aquitaine in the Fourteenth Century', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, XXI (1948), pp. 203-13.

<sup>49</sup> B. Pocquet du Haut-Jussé, 'Le grand fief breton', in *Histoire des Institutions françaises au Moyen Age*, ed. Lot and Fawtier, I, *Institutions seigneuriales* p. 277; E. Durtelle de Saint-Sauveur, *Histoire de Bretagne*, I (3rd ed. 1946), pp. 214-5.

<sup>50</sup> E. Perroy, 'Feudalism or Principalities in Fifteenth-century France', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, XX (1947), pp. 181-5. B. Pocquet du Haut-Jussé, *Deux fiefs: Bourgogne & Bretagne (1363-1491)*, 1935. It would be interesting to know how much the Breton principality of the fifteenth century owed to Edward's administration in the duchy from 1342 until 1362 and Duke John IV's upbringing in the English court.

engagement failed, as it was bound to do, for there was no reason why the king of France should risk all on such a judgement by battle. Edward tried it in 1339-40,<sup>51</sup> and even sent his personal challenge to Philip; but though his actions in the Low Countries and north-eastern France did not give him his battle and failed to win over the count of Flanders, it did give him some recognition and support in the great Flemish cities. That was so much gained; and it might have suggested a 'provincial strategy', for the essence of the agreement he made with those who would support him in Flanders was that he should give them those things which they could not obtain from King Philip—not economic facilities only, but release from ecclesiastical penalties imposed at the instance of King Philip, the restoration of the 'western provinces' lost in the wars of the past 150 years, a common currency for Flanders, Brabant and France, and protection in their persons and their property particularly from impositions and exactions laid upon them by the king of France<sup>52</sup>—and the campaign of 1340 was fought ostensibly to redeem his promise. Whatever his ultimate aim, the immediate objective then was of provincial significance.

This 'provincial strategy' is well seen in Edward's handling of the succession dispute in Brittany which arose on the death of Duke John III in April 1341.<sup>53</sup> In a sense Edward was following a policy which may perhaps be traced ultimately to the ambitions of the dukes of Normandy in the tenth and eleventh centuries, certainly to the time when the sea route from London and Southampton to Bordeaux and Bayonne came to have some importance for the kings of England. Their need to maintain a friendly Brittany is well shown in the use which John, Henry III and Edward I made of the earldom of Richmond, traditionally a possession of the ducal house of Brittany.<sup>54</sup> During Edward II's reign it seemed as though Richmond and Brittany might go to different branches of the family; but when John of Brittany died in 1334, Edward III restored Richmond to Duke John III, and followed this up with marks of signal favour.<sup>55</sup> Not only were Breton possessions in England specifically exempted from the general seizure of French property at the beginning of the war,<sup>56</sup> but the earldom of Richmond was left in Duke John's hands to the day of his death, notwithstanding the fact that he had taken part, on the French side, in the campaigns of 1339 and 1340.

It had long been known that his death would lead to a succession

<sup>51</sup> And again in 1355?—Delachenal, *Histoire de Charles V*, I, p. 108.

<sup>52</sup> *Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1338-1340*, pp. 511-16; H. S. Lucas, *The Low Countries and the Hundred Years' War*, pp. 362-3.

<sup>53</sup> The best account of the Breton war of succession, though it stands in need of considerable amendment both in detail and in general interpretation, is still A. Le Moyne de la Borderie, *Histoire de Bretagne*, III (1899). Cf. Durtelle de Saint-Sauveur, *Histoire de Bretagne*, I, pp. 237-52; E. Déprez, 'La "Querelle de Bretagne" . . .', *Mém. de la Soc. d'histoire et d'archéologie de Bretagne*, VII (1926), pp. 25-60.

<sup>54</sup> S. Painter, *The Scourge of the Clergy: Peter of Dreux, Duke of Brittany* (1937); G. E. C., *Complete Peerage*, art. 'Richmond'; *Victoria County History, York, North Riding*, pp. 1-9.

<sup>55</sup> E.g. *Cal. Close Rolls, 1339-1341*, p. 450—and note the date, 18 February 1340.

<sup>56</sup> *Fœdera*, II, p. 982. Cf. e.g. *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1340-43*, p. 73 etc.



dispute, and that, of the two candidates, the king of France favoured Charles of Blois. His rival, John of Montfort, was likely therefore to turn to Edward on general grounds, and also because the earldom of Richmond, if he could persuade Edward to grant it to him, would make a welcome addition to his meagre resources. Nevertheless, in the negotiations of the spring and summer of 1341, it was Edward who took the initiative, or so it seems.<sup>57</sup> These negotiations resulted in an alliance, a conditional grant of Richmond to John of Montfort and the promise of military assistance.<sup>58</sup>

Before the end of the year, John of Montfort was a prisoner, and his cause might well have foundered then and there but for the energy and determination of his 'lion-hearted' duchess. Fresh negotiations, conducted in her name, produced two agreements, one in the spring and the other in the summer of 1342; and this time, in return for military help, Edward was given recognition as king of France and suzerain of Brittany, the right to collect such ducal revenues as could still be levied and the use of such castles, towns and ports as he might require for his troops.<sup>59</sup> After John of Montfort's death in 1345, Edward acted as guardian of his heir and namesake (who was brought up in England), and governed the duchy, or such of it as he controlled, both as suzerain and as guardian. The civil administration which he set up there was as near normal as, in the circumstances, it could be. He set up courts and appointed officials according to the laws and customs of the country, and was able to maintain some degree of continuity in the forms and institutions of government.<sup>60</sup> He never attempted to occupy the duchy as a whole, though opportunities were presented to him in 1346 and 1352. His objective was to maintain a strong military foothold there, sufficient to give confidence and security to the supporters of John of Montfort who recognized him as king of France and suzerain of Brittany, to encourage their loyalty and to win new adherents by grants

<sup>57</sup> This point can hardly be said to be established, but it is strongly suggested by Edward's policy up to the time of John III's death and by the time-table of events, so far as we know them, in the weeks immediately following. John III died on 30 April, 1341. A letter patent dated 10 May refers to him as though he were still living (*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1340-43*, p. 185), though his lands were committed to custody by an order dated 16 May (*Cal. Fine Rolls, 1337-47*, p. 225). This suggests that the news reached the English court at some time between those dates. Now Richard Swaffham and Gavin Corder, who were sent on an important mission to John of Montfort 'super aliquibus eidem Duci ex parte Regis exponendis & ad audiendum & recipiendum & reportandum Regi super hiis deliberacionem & voluntatem dicti ducis', left London on 6 June (Swaffham's expenses account, Pope Roll, 16 Edw. III m. 48r). The terms of their commission, as paraphrased in this account, suggests that it was Edward who was making proposals; and, seeing that the Council had to decide its policy and the English envoys had to prepare for their journey, this time-table hardly allows for the reception of a Breton mission before Swaffham's departure. This same account makes it quite clear that John of Montfort did not visit England during the summer of 1341.

<sup>58</sup> *Fœdera*, II, p. 1176. Great preparations were made for an expedition in the autumn of 1341, but Murimuth was probably right when he said 'Super quo fuit diu deliberatum, sed nihil factum hoc anno': *Continuatio Chronicarum*, p. 121.

<sup>59</sup> The text of these agreements does not appear to have survived; but their substance is preserved in the commissions given to Sir Walter Mauny and the earl of Northampton. Some of these commissions are printed in *Fœdera*, II, pp. 1189, 1205.

<sup>60</sup> Le Patourel, 'L'Administration ducale dans la Bretagne montfortiste, 1345-1362', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 4<sup>e</sup> série, XXXII (1954), pp. 144-7.

of castles, lands and revenues seized from those who refused their allegiance. The objectives of Lancaster and the Black Prince in Aquitaine were fundamentally the same.

The Breton episode has been treated as something of a sideshow in the wider conflict of the fourteenth century; but when it is seen that Edward was doing in Brittany just what he was doing in Flanders, Normandy, Aquitaine, and elsewhere—gradually extending the 'area of recognition', bidding for the allegiance of seigneurs and towns—it assumes as much importance as any part of Edward's war. Indeed, it is beginning to appear that this competition for provincial allegiances, with its often sordid trade in 'confiscations', represents the way in which the war was being waged quite as much as the campaigns and the battles, and that many of the campaigns were designed as much to impress provincial opinion and provide 'confiscations' for distribution as anything else. The Valois throne was indeed at stake.

The purely military side of the war becomes more comprehensible when these provincial considerations are borne in mind. The campaigns in Brittany in 1342-3 seem to have been intended to do no more than establish a foothold in the duchy, though Edward was no doubt ready to take any opportunity that might present itself. Likewise, when it is suggested that he had nothing to show for the Crécy campaign and the exhausting siege of Calais but 'one battle and one town',<sup>61</sup> it is forgotten that, at the same time, Northampton and Dagworth had not only strengthened and extended his hold on Brittany so that it would have needed a tremendous effort on the part of the French to drive out his garrisons there, but they had also secured the person of Charles of Blois. Moreover there can be little doubt that these Breton campaigns were planned as a combined operation<sup>62</sup> with Lancaster's campaigns in Aquitaine, which completely restored the English position and prestige there. The king's invasion of Normandy may, indeed, have been secondary, designed to divert French forces from their counter-attacks in Aquitaine. The notion of simultaneous and related campaigns in several provinces had produced excellent results; and Neville's Cross was thrown in for good measure.

The outcome, when the similarly related campaigns of Lancaster in Normandy and the Black Prince in Aquitaine<sup>63</sup> had culminated in the battle of Poitiers, was impressive. Consider the situation early in 1359, irrespective of the internal dissensions which had been tearing France apart. Edward was recognized as king of France in his own duchy of

<sup>61</sup> Perroy, 'Franco-English Relations, 1350-1400', *History*, XXI, p. 149.

<sup>62</sup> This seems to follow from the terms of the commissions, *Federa*, III, 34-5, 37. Northampton was to operate in Brittany and France, Lancaster in Aquitaine and (as documents issued by him and enrolled on the Gascon rolls show) Languedoc. Cf. *Cal. Patent Rolls*, 1348-50, p. 541.

<sup>63</sup> H. J. Hewitt (*The Black Prince's Expedition of 1355-1357* (1958), pp. 101, 105-7) is doubtful if there was co-ordination between them; but if there was not, Lancaster's march to the Loire is hard to explain. Cf. Delachenal, *Histoire de Charles V*, I, pp. 129, 203, 266, and the indenture calendared in *The Black Prince's Register*, part IV (1933), pp. 143-5.

Aquitaine, secured and enlarged by the successes of Lancaster and the Black Prince; in a large part of Brittany, where allegiance was supported and maintained by English garrisons and by the later campaigns of Bentley and Lancaster; in Normandy likewise, thanks to the alliance with Philip of Navarre and the establishment of English garrisons there; in Calais and the surrounding country; and in large parts of Flanders.<sup>64</sup> Add to that one unlooked-for result of the indenture system and the static garrison warfare in Normandy and Brittany—the formation of what were in effect free companies that were now spreading almost unchecked far into the Loire provinces, into Picardy, Champagne and even into Burgundy<sup>65</sup>—and it will appear that Edward had some reason to think that the time had come for a ‘coronation in force’. What the effect of such a coronation might have been is shown by a clause in the treaty of Guillon by which the duke of Burgundy agreed to accept Edward as king of France if he were duly crowned in Reims Cathedral.<sup>66</sup>

This methodical provincial strategy, this striving for local recognition, tend to confirm the evidence quoted earlier in favour of the thesis that Edward’s objective was the crown of France and nothing less; and the situation of 1359, which explains and in a sense justifies the terms of the ‘Second Treaty of London’ (since nearly all that he demanded in that treaty was in some sense his already), suggests that he had come a great deal nearer to this objective than has commonly been thought.

The spring of 1359 saw the climax in his fortunes. Thereafter things soon began to go wrong. He ignored Charles of Navarre in his plans for the final campaign, with the result that that slippery prince remained neutral and non-participant when he might have been useful—or did Edward think that the time had come to throw him over since he, too, had claims to the throne of France? In addition, Edward’s security was very bad in 1359. It was known so well in advance that he would make for Reims that the citizens had time to complete and strengthen the new defences of their city.<sup>67</sup> On this occasion it was the future Charles V who directed the defence of his country; and his strategy of avoiding an engagement at all costs, whatever the invading armies might be doing, won its first great victory. The treaty of Brétigny-Calais registers Edward’s defeat; for although he might repent of his concessions and shirk the fulfilment of its terms, he had shot his bolt.

<sup>64</sup> By the Treaty of Brétigny, Edward undertook to renounce ‘homagio, superioritati & dominio ducatum Normannie & Turonie, comitatum Andegavie & de Mayne; et superioritati & homagio ducatus Britannie; superioritati & homagio comitatus & patrie Flandrie...’, *Fœdera*, III, 489.

<sup>65</sup> Delachenal, *Histoire de Charles V*, II, pp. 21–45; S. Luce, *Histoire de Bertrand du Gueslin... La jeunesse de Bertrand* (1876), pp. 458–509; A. Denifle, *La Guerre de Cent Ans et la désolation des églises...*, I, i (1899), pp. 217–316.

<sup>66</sup> *Fœdera*, III, p. 473; cf. Delachenal, *Histoire de Charles V*, II, p. 170.

<sup>67</sup> Delachenal, *Histoire de Charles V*, II, pp. 154–7.



---

## A NOTE ON THE TERM 'THIRTY YEARS WAR'

---

F. L. CARSTEN  
*Westfield College, London*

TEN YEARS AGO Dr. S. H. Steinberg put forward a new interpretation of the Thirty Years War in the columns of this journal. Its tendency was to deny the catastrophic character of this war, even for those German territories which had been hit by it, and to reassess the economic consequences of the war within the framework of an alleged general decline starting about the middle of the sixteenth century and thus not due to the war.<sup>1</sup> In the course of that article Dr. Steinberg wrote:

Seventeenth-century authors speak of the military events of the first half of the century as 'wars', 'bella' in the plural and clearly distinguish between the '*bellum Bohemicum*', '*bellum Suecicum*' and so forth. The figure 'thirty' and the singular 'war' seems to occur for the first time in Pufendorf's *De statu imperii Germanici* (1667) . . .<sup>2</sup>

If it is true that the seventeenth century did not think of the war as one war, this would be a point of importance and might necessitate a re-valuation of the events that we have grown accustomed to call the Thirty Years War. There is, however, definite evidence to the contrary. I have cited elsewhere a letter of March 1659 from the Elector Ferdinand Maria to the deputies of the Estates of Bavaria, in which he used the term 'Thirty Years War'.<sup>3</sup> More recently I have found in the State Archives at Stuttgart a whole series of references to the war in the singular. The first—from the year 1655—interestingly enough speaks of the great poverty and penury of the duchy's inhabitants as due to the past 'Twenty Years War': 'beij Unsserer Underthanen bekanter grosser Armuetthen und ohnvermöglickeit, darin dieselbe beij vorgeswestem Zwanzig jährigen Krieg gestürzt worden . . .'<sup>4</sup> For Württemberg it had indeed been a Twenty Years War because the duchy had not been touched by it until 1628. Four years later we find a reference to the

<sup>1</sup> I have discussed this part of Dr. Steinberg's interpretation in 'Was there an economic decline in Germany before the Thirty Years' War?', *English Historical Review*, lxxii, 1956, pp. 240 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *History*, xxxii, 1947, p. 92.

<sup>3</sup> See *English Historical Review*, lxxii, 1956, p. 240, n. 4.

<sup>4</sup> State Archives Stuttgart, *Tomi Actorum Provincialium Wurtembergicorum*, liii, p. 1278: draft of a *Recess* of 12 March 1655.

ruin and immeasurable loss suffered by the duchy through the 'German War' which had lasted for such a long time:

in was grossen unüberdenklichen Schaden, Verlust, und ruin, auch bluetstürzung, dises Herzogthum . . . durch den lang gewehrten teutschen Krieg gesezet . . . bis endlich der Allerhöchste seine gnad verlihen, dass zu Münster und Osnabrugg besondere Tractaten angestellet und nach langem tractiren ein allgemeiner Friden geschlossen . . .<sup>5</sup>

The Estates of Württemberg appear to have first used the term 'Thirty Years War' in 1666, pointing to the experience of the war as a reason for declining a ducal demand for a money grant for the building of fortifications:

Es weisen die Exempla der Jenigen in dem H. Reich gelegener Ihrer Vöstungen den fürgewehrten 30 Jährigen Krieg hindurch zwar destituirter, aber auff dise stund noch nicht restituirter Stände, wie hoch Ihre Majores und Löbl: vorfordern Sich dergleichen fortification Kosten ankomen lassen . . .<sup>6</sup>

Two years later the Estates twice used the same term in opposing a money grant to enable the Duke to hire mercenaries on account of the war in the Spanish Netherlands and the military preparations of France in Alsace and elsewhere.<sup>7</sup> In 1670 the Duke asked his Estates for a new grant because his ordinary revenues had sharply declined on account of the long 'German War'.<sup>8</sup> In 1673 and in 1675 the Estates, resisting further ducal demands, again referred to the damage which the country had suffered during the Thirty Years War.<sup>9</sup>

All these examples, to which more could be added, are taken from private and unpublished exchanges between the Duke and the Estates. There is thus no suspicion of propaganda or of any ulterior motive attached to the terms used in this correspondence, as there might have been in the writings of Pufendorf and other authors addressed to a wider public. At least in these documents, there seem to be no references whatever to the wars in the plural: both the Duke and the Estates clearly thought of the events of 1618–48 as one war, and that a war with catastrophic effects on the economic and financial situation of Württemberg.

<sup>5</sup> State Archives Stuttgart, *Tomi Actorum Provincialium Wurtembergicorum*, lviii, pp. 563–4: proposition to the Diet of 5 January 1659.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, lxxvii, fo. 196: declaration of the Estates of 26 November 1666.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, lxxviii, fos. 416, 570: declaration of the Estates of 13 February and 7 March 1668.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, lxx, fo. 137: ducal proposition of 12 January 1670.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, lxxiii, fo. 494: deliberation of the Estates of 24 March 1673; lxxvii, fo. 691: declaration of the Estates of 8 March 1675.

---

# THE BACKGROUND OF THE CALAS AFFAIR<sup>1</sup>

---

DAVID D. BIEN  
*Wesleyan University, Connecticut*

THE CELEBRATED CALAS AFFAIR had its beginning at Toulouse in a cloth goods shop on the busy rue des Filatiers during the evening of 13 October 1761. It was there that the mother, father, brother and a Protestant friend of Marc-Antoine Calas, descending from the second-floor living quarters where together they had dined and chatted, came upon the body of the twenty-nine year old Huguenot. The cause of his death is as uncertain to-day as it was then. Had this young merchant hanged himself, as the family was later to claim? Or was he strangled by an enemy or housebreaker as he took inventory alone in the shop?<sup>2</sup> Whatever the conclusion, one fact is clear: within twenty-four hours after the death of Marc-Antoine many Catholics at Toulouse, among them neighbours and friends of the family, were discussing the Calas 'murder' in excited terms. As these Catholics saw it, the Calvinist parents and brother had themselves plotted and carried out the killing. Their motive for the crime was hatred for the Catholicism to which, as rumour had it, Marc-Antoine had secretly been converted. In the popular mind this act of the family was perfectly consistent with its religion, for had not Calvin himself required all Calvinist mothers and fathers to kill any of their offspring who abandoned their faith?<sup>3</sup> When the parlement of Toulouse subsequently passed sentence on Jean Calas, it appeared that these views had been dignified by judicial decision. In any event, the court decided that the murder of a son and brother by Huguenots acting in concert for the sake of their religion was a reasonable possibility, and rejected the alternative explanations of suicide or murder by an outsider.

The verdict has been explained by the religious fanaticism of the

<sup>1</sup> I wish to express my thanks to Professors Crane Brinton and Franklin L. Ford of Harvard University for their advice.

<sup>2</sup> Among many books on this subject may be mentioned A. Coquerel, *Jean Calas et sa famille*, 1858, and the more recent A. Coutet, *Jean Calas roué vif et innocent*, en Cévennes, 1933, for treatments highly sympathetic to the Calas, and M. Chassaigne, *L'Affaire Calas*, 1929, for a full presentation of the evidence against them.

<sup>3</sup> Evidence for the circulation of these opinions emerges from an examination of the depositions of witnesses at the trial. See Archives Départementales de la Haute Garonne (cited hereafter as A.D.H.G.), 101 B/2, Procès Calas, 13 Octobre au 18 Novembre 1761. Procédure des Capitouls.



members of the parlement, described by Voltaire during his campaign for its reversal as 'barbarous Druids'; it has been attributed also to the gross incompetence of their judicial procedure; but neither of these factors seems fully adequate to explain what is now generally agreed to have been a major judicial error. The object of this paper is to investigate some other factors in the general and specific situation which have been largely unstudied.

Languedoc was one of the chief centres of French Protestantism; its Calvinists numbered over 200,000, perhaps more than one-third of the total for France as a whole.<sup>4</sup> In Toulouse itself, however, the Protestants were not numerous. There were ten or twelve Huguenots in the legal profession; another fifteen were merchants, like Calas, while others were placed lower in the social scale, as Swiss pastry cooks chiefly, but with a sprinkling of workers, apprentices, and maids. A rough guess at the number in Toulouse at any given time would be 200 persons, including wives and children.<sup>5</sup> In a growing city of 50,000 this was a very small and inconspicuous minority.

When the Catholics at Toulouse reflected on Protestantism, which in quiet times was not often, their opinions were shaped largely by traditional and historical associations. The *Almanach de Languedoc*, printed at Toulouse and read, as Malesherbes noted, by 'the least learned and most credulous of men', presents one aspect of the popular picture of Protestantism quite clearly.<sup>6</sup> In a summary history of Languedoc, repeated in each annual edition, the *Almanach* described the spread of Protestantism and the Religious Wars, 'lit by a false principle of religion, fomented by the ambition of the notables and private hatreds', which had brought nothing but 'massacre, burnings, sacrileges' to Toulouse.<sup>7</sup> An historical essay on religion in Languedoc, which was added to the *Almanach* in 1754, dwelt at length on the fanaticism of the Protestants, the pillaging and burning of churches, and all the harrowing social disintegrations that the religious struggles had produced.<sup>8</sup>

The crucial events which shaped Catholic opinion for the fifty years after 1715, however, were those of the Camisard revolt, toward the end of Louis XIV's reign, in the Cévennes, the hilly country north of Nîmes in eastern Languedoc.<sup>9</sup> In the absence of trained and educated pastors, impelled by religious oppression, and led by local 'prophets',

<sup>4</sup> B. Poland, *French Protestantism and the French Revolution*, 1957, pp. 8-17, 283-90.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. A.D.H.G., 4E2648, *Registre des Déclarations des Mariages, Naissances, et Décès des Non-Catholiques, Reçues à Toulouse pendant l'année 1788 en Exécution de l'Edit du mois de Novembre 1787*; Archives Municipales de Toulouse: GG490-512, parish registers; GG781, *Le Present Registre Servant pour constater le Décès des Personnes de la Religion Protestante, 1766-1787*; GG782, *Registre des Baptêmes et Mariages de la Religion protestante du 9 Juin 1788 au 12 Janvier 1792*.

<sup>6</sup> Lamoignon de Malesherbes to St. Priest, 23 August 1758. Archives Départementales de l'Hérault (cited as A.D.H.), C. 2812.

<sup>7</sup> *Almanach historique et chronologique de Languedoc, et des provinces du ressort du Parlement de Toulouse; contenant tout ce qui concerne le Clergé, l'Etat Civil et Littéraire, et le Commerce de ces Provinces*, Toulouse, 1752, p. 14.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 1754, p. 24.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. J. Dedieu, *Le rôle politique des protestants français, 1685-1715*, 1920.

the peasants of the Cévennes had by 1701 developed a thoroughly unorthodox movement which turned into a kind of religious frenzy. One Pierre Chantegrel, possessed of the Holy Spirit, as proof of it walked barefoot through flames before his enthusiastic followers.<sup>10</sup> The excitement soon took a political form as devotees spread the conviction that they were the instruments of God venting His wrath on Louis XIV in a holy struggle. Sometimes in small bands engaging in guerrilla warfare and at other times collected into forces of 3000 or 4000 for open conflict with royal troops, the Camisards were in armed rebellion from 1702 to 1710. Sustained on the popular level by mass religious excitement, and in the leadership by English and Dutch money, these rebels were a constant threat to the flank of the French military forces resisting the armies of the coalition. Ill-trained and badly organized, the Camisards were not nearly so serious a threat as the hard-pressed royal authorities thought they were; but long after the wars were over and Louis XIV dead, it was remembered how foreign enemies and domestic Protestants had joined in an effort which nearly destroyed France.

The administration of the laws against the Protestants, which insisted on ritual performance of Catholicism by all Frenchmen, was inconsistent and spasmodic after 1715. The failure to enforce the laws systematically or fully, however, does not mean that the persecution was imaginary in the eighteenth century. Nine of the twenty-five Protestant pastors put to death as required by the Revocation died after 1715, and of these, six were hanged between 1745 and 1762.<sup>11</sup> Lists of prisoners on the galleys at Toulon in 1753 include the names of forty-eight Protestants who were there for Calvinist religious acts alone. In 1754 there were twenty-five Protestant women locked up in the Tower of Constance for the same reason.<sup>12</sup> The total number of Protestant prisoners can only be guessed at. On three occasions after 1715 there was a systematic effort to apply the anti-Protestant laws in the thoroughgoing fashion of Louis XIV, in 1724, 1745 and 1750-2. At these times there were military raids on Huguenot assemblies, and sustained efforts to track down ministers and to enforce Catholic marriage and baptism, as distinct from the usual sporadic harassment of Protestants which went on until 1763.<sup>13</sup>

In this period any open manifestation of the religious practices of the Reformed Church was taken as a direct threat to the national security. To the authorities, Calvinist views were undesirable, but they were hardly a cause for much concern. The practice of Calvinism, however, was quite a different matter. From the Huguenot assemblies in particular could come revolt. Of the seventy-three Protestants in

<sup>10</sup> Agnès de la Gorce, *Camisards et dragons du roi*, 1950, p. 74.

<sup>11</sup> See the list of pastors executed in France in C. Coquerel, *Histoire des églises du désert chez les protestants de France depuis la fin du règne de Louis XIV jusqu'à la révolution française*, 1841, i. 507-9.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 512-23.

<sup>13</sup> Poland, *op cit.*, p. 64.

the galleys and the Tower of Constance in 1754, fifty-five were there only for having attended a religious assembly.<sup>14</sup> As the intendant of Languedoc explained in response to efforts by Frederick the Great in 1741 to get these Protestant prisoners released:

... la plus grande partie ont été condamnées par des jugements en forme, non pas pour n'avoir point rempli les devoirs de Catholiques parcequ'on ne leur fait aucune violence à cet égard, mais pour avoir contrevenu aux ordonnances du Roy, en fomentant ou assistant à ces assemblées de religionnaires très contraires aux intentions de sa majesté.<sup>15</sup>

If it was the political threat which the Protestants were felt to pose which sustained the persecution, it was the conditions in the country in time of war which help to explain why the persecution went no further than it did. With the troops drawn off to fight the enemy it was essential that order be maintained at home. At the very time when the Protestants were presumed most dangerous, the royal authorities were least equipped to deal with them. The Huguenots had to be taught respect for royal strength, but they could not be pushed so far as to cause them to revolt. It was in this situation, therefore, that they were liable to appear most frightening.

During the war of the Austrian Succession the hesitation and uneasiness of the royal authorities can be sensed. When, in March 1745, local officials launched an attack on an assembly of several thousand Huguenots and took nine prisoners, all ultimately sentenced to the galleys, both the intendant Le Nain and his superior, St. Florentin, censured their action. St. Florentin wrote that 'Sa majesté a jugé nécessaire d'y suivre le plan de modération qu'elle a trouvé et qu'elle trouve toujours le plus sûr et le meilleur, dans la circonstance où elle a besoin de toutes ses troupes dans ses armées.'<sup>16</sup> The minister added that if an outbreak occurred, severe repression was needed, but in general it was better and safer to let the Protestants alone.

In the same year there was a brief alarm at Toulouse. On 5 February the *subdélégué* wrote to the intendant that he had been told that rifle or pistol shots had been fired during the previous evening from the rooftops of houses in various sections of the city. People suspect, he added, that this is a prearranged signal for the Huguenots to gather. He was informed, too, that several days before, a man whom people suspected of being a Protestant minister had come into Toulouse to conduct marriages, and that Protestants were infiltrating in small groups, so as to avoid recognition by the Catholics. On receiving these reports, the subdelegate had troops stationed in the quarters where Huguenots were known to live and where it was believed they held their assemblies.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>14</sup> C. Coquerel, *op. cit.*, pp. 512-23. <sup>15</sup> Bernage to Amelot, 24 Nov. 1741. A.D.H., C. 423.

<sup>16</sup> St. Florentin to Le Nain, 28 March 1745, quoted by É. Galland, *L'Affaire Sirven*, Mazamet, 1911, pp. 9-10, from A.D.H., C. 213.

<sup>17</sup> Charlary to Le Nain, 5 Feb. 1745. A.D.H.G., C. 66.



In 1761 and 1762, during the Seven Years War, signs of a rising fear of Protestants are again visible. The fact that the war was being fought by France against two Protestant powers, England and Prussia, was perhaps not unconnected with the resurgence of anti-Protestant feeling. In one week in January 1762 the intendant of Languedoc twice refused to enforce the laws relating to baptism and marriage on Protestants for fear of compromising royal authority. He felt, once again with St. Florentin's approval, that to prosecute Protestants without the armed force necessary to carry out the decision was worse than taking no action at all.<sup>18</sup> The fear of a revolt by the Protestants was thus magnified in the minds of the authorities by their feeling of powerlessness to control one if it should occur.

Economic and social conditions reinforced the general uneasiness at Toulouse as elsewhere. For France as a whole the total value of the export and import trade during the Seven Years War stood at only 60 per cent of the pre-war level.<sup>19</sup> The trade of Bordeaux, the Atlantic outlet for the Canal du Midi and the Garonne, on which Toulouse is located, was affected even more than that of most French ports. English mastery of the sea reduced the value of the vital sugar imports at Bordeaux from an average annual value of 10·8 million livres, for the years 1749 to 1756, to a paltry 1·3 million a year from 1757 to 1762.<sup>20</sup> Toulouse itself was not so immediately sensitive to the trade depression as was a centre of textile manufactures such as Montauban. Although Toulouse produced some cheap woollen goods, it was chiefly as an administrative and legal centre and as the *entrepôt* for one of France's richest grain-producing areas, the Garonne Valley, that the city retained its importance.<sup>21</sup> In good years the district produced a surplus of wheat which was sent to Provence or to the Atlantic region, but these were uncertain markets. Depending on the success of the grain trade for its economic life-blood, Toulouse was especially sensitive to fluctuations in the price of wheat and to the disruptive effects both of bad harvests and of gluts.

During the war years the effects of the trade depression gradually worked back into the hinterland from the coast until Toulouse itself was affected. Dependent as it was on the economy of the surrounding farm country, the city needed a prosperous peasantry for its own economic health. As the rich coastal markets were drying up because of the decline in overseas trade, both farm products and the products of cottage industry lost their outlet, and with the fall in rural purchasing power Toulouse also suffered. The near bankruptcy of Calas himself

<sup>18</sup> St. Priest to St. Florentin, 20 and 25 Jan. 1762; St. Florentin to St. Priest, 30 Jan. 1762. A.D.H., C. 449.

<sup>19</sup> T. Malvezin, *Histoire du commerce de Bordeaux depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours*, Bordeaux, 1892, iii. 322-3.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 302-5.

<sup>21</sup> F. Buchalet, *L'assistance publique à Toulouse au dix-huitième siècle*, Toulouse, 1904, pp. 17-18; L. Viala, *La question des grains et leur commerce à Toulouse au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, 1715-1789*, Toulouse, 1909, pp. 35-7.

was one expression of a general economic crisis involving the tradesmen of the city. Even more serious was the short-run movement of grain prices. Throughout the century times of bad harvests and high grain prices were also times of serious social unrest in Toulouse. The reason for this was not merely the misery of city consumers for whom bread was, of course, the staple of the diet. Beyond this, hard times drew many unemployed farm workers and others into the city in search of work and charity. In the years 1709-13 the city officials had even had to post guards at the city gates to keep these people out.<sup>22</sup>

The association of social unrest with high grain prices is illustrated in the autumn of 1747 and in January 1748 by extensive bread riots, which resulted in the hanging of the ringleaders. It is not a coincidence that grain prices, which in 1746 had ranged between 6 livres 9 sous and 10 livres 13 sous for a *setier*, had moved steadily upward to a high point of 15 livres 18 sous in May 1748. A similar situation occurred in 1773, when severe riots followed the movement of the wheat price to 19 livres 4 sous in April 1773 from a level of 15 livres 11 sous in April of the preceding year.<sup>23</sup>

When we look at the period of the Seven Years War in Toulouse, the social as well as the economic bases of local anxieties and frustrations become clear. At the end of 1759 Pierre Barthès, diarist and chronicler of Toulouse, summarized that year as

triste et misérable à tous égards . . . la guerre continuant toujours, le commerce entièrement détruit, l'artisan ne faisant rien et mourant de misère par le défaut et la cherté des choses les plus nécessaires à la vie, attendu la mauvaise récolte des denrées de toutes espèces, comme le blé, vin, millet . . .<sup>24</sup>

What Barthès meant can be seen by changes in the price of a *setier* of wheat at Toulouse taken for January of each year:

1755	.	.	.	.	6L. 10s.
1756	.	.	.	.	9L.
1757	.	.	.	.	10L. 2s.
1758	.	.	.	.	9L. 17s.
1759	.	.	.	.	14L. 2s.
1760	.	.	.	.	13L. 14s.
1761	.	.	.	.	12L. 3s.
1762	.	.	.	.	8L. 15s. <sup>25</sup>

This movement of prices had brought the usual influx of farm workers. In 1760 the subdelegate, Amblard, informed the intendant that the villagers were wandering on the roads and entering Toulouse, leaving even wives and children behind, in an effort to find work or charity.<sup>26</sup> The situation at Toulouse from 1759 to 1761 was a dangerous one. Prices fell a little in 1761, but the full effects of this would be felt only

<sup>22</sup> Buchalet, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.

<sup>24</sup> Quoted by Buchalet, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

<sup>26</sup> Buchalet, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-8.

<sup>23</sup> Viala, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-60, 114-17.

<sup>25</sup> Viala, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-17.

after the next winter and there was inevitably a lag, a persistence of social unrest and fears into 1762. It is true that there were no revolts or riots at Toulouse at this time, but it is important to recognize that circumstances existed in which they commonly occurred.

For all these frustrations the Protestant was a perfect scapegoat. The Protestant tradition was, to the Catholic, one involving disloyalty to France, civil war, internal unrest, and peasant uprisings. In a time of military failure, social unrest, and economic distress, the Protestant appeared more dangerous than he would either earlier or later.

\* \* \*

The immediate events from which the extreme anti-Protestant excitement of 1761-2 at Toulouse was to grow took place in the small village of Caussade, north of Montauban. There, during the night of 13 September 1761, a Protestant minister, François Rochette, was brought into town by an armed patrol which had arrested him in the country on suspicion of being a highwayman. The next day the officials of Caussade went to the Town Hall where the prisoner was being held. When questioned by them, Rochette freely admitted his identity; a search of his belongings produced a register of Protestant marriages and baptisms, seven or eight notebooks of sermons, and his ministerial robes.<sup>27</sup>

The events of the succeeding days in the Caussade region appear nearly as confused today as they did to the participants. Caussade was surrounded by farming country where up to half of the peasantry was Protestant in religion. September 13 was a Sunday and on the Monday an important fair was held in Caussade, which attracted large crowds from the surrounding countryside. It is clear that some attempt was made by a group of Protestants to get their minister released. The local *curé* speaks of a 'collection of seditious men armed with sticks' together with a crowd of countrymen, who were in Caussade for the fair, appearing at the prison to try to force the door and rescue Rochette. He adds that the Catholics repulsed them.<sup>28</sup> It was in this situation that there began to spread in the town rumours that the Protestants were coming, just as in July 1789 at the time of the Grande Peur the 'brigands' would be coming.<sup>29</sup> The invading army of Protestants was just as fictitious as the brigands of 1789, but the important fact is that the inhabitants of Caussade on that Monday were already starting to panic at the

<sup>27</sup> Court de Gébelin, *Les Toulousaines ou Lettres Historiques et apologetiques en faveur de la Religion Reformée, et de divers Protestans condamnés dans ces derniers tems par le Parlement de Toulouse, ou dans le Haut Languedoc*, Edimbourg [Lausanne], 1763, pp. 13-15; 'Relation de la prise du nommé Rochette, Ministre de la Religion protestante, et des trois frères Grenier, gentilshommes verriers', Bibliothèque Municipale de Toulouse, MS. 727, pp. 335-42; Poujade to the President d'Alliès de Caumont, 18 Sept. 1761, printed in O. de Grenier-Fajal, *Rochette et les trois frères Grenier*, Montauban, 1886, p. 223.

<sup>28</sup> 'Relation de la prise du nommé Rochette', p. 338.

<sup>29</sup> See the excellent article by D. Ligou, 'Essai d'interprétation psychologique des événements de Septembre 1761 à Caussade', *Congrès régional des Fédérations historiques de Languedoc*, Carcassonne, May 1952, pp. 172-4.



thought of a huge mob of Protestant peasants on the way to cut their throats and burn their property.

The security measures taken in the town are a good indication of the fright which quickly took hold. Protestants were locked up, the alarm bells sounded, and couriers sent to surrounding towns for military reinforcements.<sup>30</sup> The officials announced that the fair would be postponed for a week. Orders to close were sent to all shops and taverns, while women and children were directed to return to their homes. As the fear mounted, the Catholic peasants who remained were provided with guns and clubs, and arranged hastily in an impromptu battle formation to await the enemy.<sup>31</sup> According to the *curé*, the women fled, screaming, 'All is lost!' Men broke up chairs to provide the weapons they would need for their own defence. The *maire* ordered that each house should keep lights burning during the night, and reinforced patrols guarded the town. One patrol of the militia, on Tuesday night, 15 September, encountered three 'gentlemen glassmakers', the Grenier brothers, under conditions which are not known, arresting them as ring-leaders of the Protestant revolt. An 8 p.m. curfew was imposed on all but those who were on the official business of defending the town, while a sentinel was ordered to the bell tower to watch for the attack.<sup>32</sup>

The panic psychology operating among the Catholics at Caussade is shown clearly in the accounts of the events which they wrote. Their references, erroneous as they were, to hundreds of Protestants roaming the countryside in murderous bands, reflect the stories which the Catholics heard and repeated in the town. Cathala-Coture, a liberal *avocat* at Caussade, set down in a history twenty-five years later his recollection of the events. He wrote that groups of Protestants numbering between 200 and 600 men, all armed with guns, clubs and farm tools, were circulating, waiting their chance to sack the town. This they would surely have done, he added, but for the wise measures taken by the *maire* and *consuls*. The critical event was the capture of the Grenier brothers, who according to our lawyer-historian were leaders of the revolt. This, he said, was effected after a bitter fight in the fields between 200 or 300 Protestants and a small band of brave Catholics. The Catholics with the aid of some friendly peasants dispersed the Huguenots though outnumbered ten to one.<sup>33</sup>

The narrative of the *curé* at Caussade illustrates the Catholic alarm equally well. He wrote of reports in the town that there were 500 or 600 peasants located at strong points near by during the night of 14 September, and that the advance guards of these forces were reconnoitring, preparing the signal for the attack. The priest narrated

<sup>30</sup> When on Tuesday and Wednesday these troops joined the townsmen already pressed into emergency service, there was at hand an armed force estimated at 1500. Cf. *ibid.*

<sup>31</sup> Poujade to Allès de Caumont, 18 Sept. 1761, printed in Grenier-Fajal, *op. cit.*, pp. 223-5.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 'Relation de la prise du nommé Rochette', pp. 338-42; Gêbelin, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-7; Ligou, *loc. cit.*, pp. 169-75.

<sup>33</sup> Cathala-Coture, *Histoire politique, ecclésiastique et littéraire du Quercy*, Montauban, 1785,

an encounter in a meadow where a Protestant charge was led by a horseman who was shouting, 'Kill! Kill!' The Catholics repulsed this attack, only to face another the next morning at 4 a.m. This was the one in which the Greniers were captured, and, according to the *curé*, everybody said the Huguenots had had five or six killed in addition to suffering the loss of the Greniers. These three brothers, he declared, were all Protestant ministers as well as being the military commanders of the Calvinists.<sup>34</sup> Still another Catholic reporter of the events at Caussade was one Poujade, steward of the estates of a wealthy judge at Montauban. Poujade wrote to his employer describing the beginning of the revolt, saying that 'at that moment we thought we were all lost'. There had been, he continued, several pitched battles with the Huguenots. In one of these 300 Protestants charged at a time. And the town officials had been told of the Protestants' boasting that it was their intention to burn and pillage the whole town.<sup>35</sup>

These accounts, it must be pointed out, are almost entirely imaginary. The elements which went into creating the legend of the supposed incident at Caussade were in essence social rather than religious. The lingering distrust of the peasantry on the part of the townsmen was the leaven in the situation which produced the panic.<sup>36</sup> For us, the significant feature is in what the Catholics believed to have happened, for this is the version of the events which was reported to Toulouse. When the *procureur général*, Bonrepos, went to the parlement to tell of the event, he knew only that the Huguenots in the whole district north of Montauban had engaged in a civil rebellion in which the Protestants had come within an ace of sacking Caussade. And the Huguenots' purpose had been to seize their minister from the royal authorities. Bonrepos made his report to the parlement on 19 September, describing the incident at Caussade as 'a considerable rising and sedition', an effort by Protestants to take the minister by force, and 'mob gatherings of several villages which came to Caussade to effect this escape'. The nature of the crime and its object evidently required a prompt inquiry. This the court immediately ordered.<sup>37</sup>

Only the local Protestant peasants and their pastors knew how baseless were the extravagant fears of the Catholics. The respectable Protestant businessmen at Montauban, whose main thought was always to keep on good terms with their Catholic neighbours, hastened to dissociate themselves from the alleged activities of the peasants. Indeed, their only protest throughout was the boycott of a concert on the day when Rochette and the Greniers were executed.<sup>38</sup> They would have

<sup>34</sup> 'Relation de la prise du nommé Rochette', pp. 335-42.

<sup>35</sup> See Grenier-Fajal, *op. cit.*, pp. 222-5.

<sup>36</sup> Ligou, *op. cit.*, pp. 173-5. The social element in the fear is illustrated by the solidarity between the Protestant and Catholic bourgeois of Caussade. The Protestants joined the defence, some of them participating in the patrols. Cf. Cathala-Coture, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

<sup>37</sup> A.D.H.G., B. 491, 19 Sept. 1761.

<sup>38</sup> Jeannine Garrisson, 'La bourgeoisie protestante Montalbanaise dans la seconde moitié du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle' (unpublished thesis, University of Toulouse, 1955), p. 163.

agreed with Cathala-Coture that the rising had been created by 'a great mob of common people and peasants'.<sup>39</sup> There were even those who at the Protestant National Synod in 1763 tried to have the Reformed Church formally disclaim responsibility for the supposed rebellion.<sup>40</sup> Similarly, the sympathy for those oppressed for religious reasons which was to be so conspicuously extended to the Calas family later by the enlightened writers of the day was not given to the Protestant prisoners taken at Caussade. When Ribotte, an active Protestant at Montauban, wrote asking assistance of Rousseau and Voltaire, he received only discouraging replies. Rousseau answered in October that he could scarcely believe that the prisoners would be in such a bad situation without having done something to deserve it. After reminding Ribotte that the Word of God commanded obedience to the laws of princes, Rousseau added his view of the affair: 'L'entreprise d'enlever un homme des mains de la justice ou de ses ministres, fût-il même injustement détenu, est encore une rébellion qu'on ne peut justifier, et que les puissances sont toujours en droit de punir.'<sup>41</sup> Voltaire first consulted the Marshal de Richelieu on the matter and then told Ribotte that he was powerless to help. Persons of the Calvinist faith were permitted to do what they wanted in their own homes, Voltaire wrote, but while 'Jésus-Christ a dit qu'il se trouveroit toujours entre deux ou trois personnes assemblées en son nom, . . . quand on est trois ou quatre mille, c'est le diable qui s'y trouve.'<sup>42</sup> Evidently the assumption that there had been a Protestant revolt at Caussade against royal authority was almost universally accepted.

The parlement of Toulouse reacted to this imaginary threat vigorously. Writs of arrest and orders for the prisoners to be brought to Toulouse were issued on 6 October.<sup>43</sup> The civil and political nature of the affair was indicated when the *Grand' Chambre* took to itself the judging of the case, instead of sending it to the *Chambre Tournelle*, which normally handled all criminal matters. The evidence, consisting of the depositions of sixty-four witnesses and questionings of the prisoners, was conclusive enough for the court on 28 November to order a full trial.<sup>44</sup> Under interrogation Rochette freely described his activities as Protestant minister, and admitted that he had conducted weddings and baptisms. The Greniers denied having created a revolt and shooting at Catholics with their hunting rifles. As they stated it, they were on their way to Caussade to see some friends, when they saw a mob of Catholics coming through the fields after them. At this sight they fled for their lives—this flight was the only thing which could have made them appear guilty. Their only use of violence was when one brother struck

<sup>39</sup> Cathala-Coture, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

<sup>40</sup> C. Coquerel, *op. cit.*, ii. 468-9.

<sup>41</sup> Rousseau to Ribotte, 24 Oct. 1761, printed in 'Réponse de J.-J. Rousseau à Paul Rabaut au sujet de François Rochette et des trois gentilshommes verriers. 1761', *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du Protestantisme français*, ii (1854), p. 364.

<sup>42</sup> 'La tolérance au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Lettres inédites de Voltaire à M. Ribotte de Montauban (1761-1769)', *Bull. Soc. Hist. Prot. Fr.*, xxxi (1882), p. 167.

<sup>43</sup> A.D.H.G., B. 1652, 6 Oct. 1761.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 28 Nov. 1761.



a Catholic to keep from being brained with an iron bar. All the other prisoners maintained that they were innocent, that they had been attacked and arrested simply because they were Protestants.<sup>45</sup>

For the other side there were the Catholic witnesses from Caussade, who, according to a contemporary Protestant historian, advanced a number of untruths against the accused, the Greniers in particular. One said that the three brothers tried to shoot at him, another that his collar was cut by a sword stroke by one of them. Still another witness testified to having heard the brothers say they were going to Caussade to get their minister out by force if need be. The witnesses disputed the Greniers' claim that they were all alone at their capture, though the Catholics did reduce from 200 to nine the number of Huguenots they said they met in this encounter.<sup>46</sup>

For all but Rochette the defence *mémoire* simply sustained these arguments, disputing the facts and allegations put forward by the Catholic witnesses. But the pastor's case was different. He was a minister and admitted it. According to the law, he could be put to death for this alone; but the defence argued that since he was not arrested as a Protestant minister, having been taken only by chance, he ought to be released. He had been doing only what he thought to be his duty to God. To punish him for this would not degrade him, but it would be instead a triumph for his persecuted religion.<sup>47</sup>

On 18 February 1762, all the councillors of the *Grand' Chambre* assembled for the judgement, following three days of arguments and discussion. François Rochette was declared guilty of having performed the functions of minister of the R.P.R., of having preached, baptized and married in the assemblies *au désert*. The full severity of the Royal Declarations of 1686 and 1724 was imposed on him. He was sentenced to be hanged at the Place du Salin. The three Grenier brothers were sentenced to death also, but their status as 'gentlemen glassmakers' afforded them the privilege of the nobility to execution by beheading rather than hanging.<sup>48</sup>

The other Protestant prisoners were treated less harshly. Two were sent to the galleys for terms of six and ten years, respectively, after having the letters G.A.L. burned into their right shoulders. Another was banished from the *sénéchaussées* of Toulouse and Montauban for five years, and the other six were released. Orders for the arrest of three pastors whose names appeared in the papers found on Rochette were issued; these ministers were to be seized wherever they might be found in France and brought to Toulouse for trial.<sup>49</sup> There was little doubt that the fate of Rochette would be theirs also if they could be discovered.

The next day at 2 p.m. a large crowd gathered at the Place du Salin for the spectacle of a quadruple execution. The prisoners bore up well,

<sup>45</sup> Gébelin, *op. cit.*, pp. 381-6.

<sup>46</sup> A.D.H.G., B. 1653, 18 Feb. 1762.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 386-95.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*

singing psalms and exhorting one another to show bravery for God and religion, so that the crowd was visibly impressed, even moved. For Toulousains the sight could have served, however, only to emphasize the perversity of a sect whose officials were executed for adhering to the sect's own principles and practices.

The Protestant historian of the episode, G  belin, maintained that the parlement could have spared Rochette by not recognizing him as a Protestant minister, since he alone said he was one and there were no other witnesses against him. In G  belin's opinion, 'superstition and the spirit of papism' ruled out this basic humanity for the court.<sup>50</sup> But though Rochette was condemned, in accordance with the Royal Declaration of 1724, simply for having been a pastor, the total situation indicates that his death was a result of the alleged Protestant revolt. For the Greniers the issue was clear, they had been convicted of 'sedition and riotous' assemblage while bearing arms in an effort to remove Rochette from the prison of the royal authorities at Caussade'.<sup>51</sup> The parlement's view of its r  le in the Rochette affair was summarized in the words of the royal prosecutor in a subsequent case:

Vous venez de punir dans un pr  dicant [Rochette], non l'erreur de sa conscience; mais la temerit   de sa conduite; ce n'est point comme mauvais raisonneur, mais comme seditieux, et refractaire aux ordres du roy que vous l'avez condamn  s, avec les rebelles qui s'etaient arm  s pour l'arracher des mains de la justice.<sup>52</sup>

One might well ask why the punishments meted out were so harsh. It is not enough simply to point out that punishments generally were severe in the eighteenth century, that domestic theft, for example, brought hanging. Servants and peasants could be hanged for crimes like this, but the Greniers were different. They were socially respectable, gentlemen glassmakers on the edge of nobility and enjoying the perquisites of their status, one of which—the right to execution by beheading rather than hanging—the court clearly recognized. The aspect of the case which needs to be emphasized is the development in Toulouse itself, and in the minds of the public authorities there, of a panic psychology not altogether unlike that at Caussade. Panic may be too strong a word, since there were certainly no manifestations of fear at Toulouse in the extreme forms which prevailed in the village north of Montauban; but there are clear signs of the growth of a vague anxiety, imprecise at all times, but always present after the arrival of the Huguenot prisoners in October. Exactly what the Toulouse authorities feared is not certain, but the best guess would be that they anticipated some organized effort by Huguenots to free their men by force.

The first sign of such a fear showed itself in the transfer of the prisoners

<sup>50</sup> G  belin, *op. cit.*, pp. 398–9.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 6 March 1762.

<sup>51</sup> A.D.H.G., B. 1653, 18 Feb. 1762.

from Montauban to Toulouse on 23 October. On that day eight soldiers, dressed carefully and disguised to hide their mission, brought the pastor Rochette and the guide arrested with him to Toulouse in a closed carriage.<sup>53</sup> Apparently afraid to risk too much at one time, the authorities put off moving the other prisoners, including the Greniers, until the next day. On 24 October these prisoners were placed in a covered wagon drawn by three horses and taken to Toulouse with a considerable military escort, composed of at least fifty soldiers who rode well-armed and sword in hand, evidently expecting at every step an ambush by Huguenots.<sup>54</sup> The swords remained drawn until the alleged rebels were deposited in the prison of the parlement in the middle of the city.

The uneasiness of the Toulouse authorities over the Protestants had been developing for several days before the prisoners arrived, probably in anticipation of the event. When on 21 October the gatekeepers of the city noticed some unidentified horsemen, the *capitouls* took measures to find out who they were. Stories spread that a great many Huguenots were coming into the city, ten or twelve at a time, and that they departed only on finding out that the *capitouls* were taking measures to seek them out.<sup>55</sup>

The fear did not cease once the accused Calvinist rebels were locked up. The prison of the parlement was in the *Palais de Justice*, which was surrounded by a wall that enclosed also an area in front of this court building where there were small shops. Beyond these shops, through a gate, was the Place du Salin, a small but busy square. After the Huguenots were brought in, the normal police guard in the Place du Salin was doubled and four sentinels were placed at intervals between the door of the prison and this square. These sentinels took positions so that they could summon the reinforced guard quickly by a whistle blast in case of need.<sup>56</sup> Early in November special sentry-boxes were brought in and placed, one in the square, one at the gate between the square and the Palais enclosure, and another at the door to the prison. The diarist Barthès said the reason for this was doubtless to be better able to protect those living in the enclosure should there be any attempt at a rescue of the prisoners.<sup>57</sup> In the eyes of the authorities, men capable of conducting armed rebellion at Caussade were entirely capable of a raid in force on Toulouse to gain their fanatical ends.

This lingering fear of what Protestants could do might have been

<sup>53</sup> Pierre Barthès, 'Les heures perdues, ou Recueil des choses dignes d'être transmises à la postérité, arrivées en cette ville ou près d'icy'. Bibliothèque Municipale de Toulouse, MS. 703, p. 55.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.* The size of the escort is my own guess based on a comparison of the costs of the two expeditions. To bring Rochette and his guide to Toulouse the expense was 98 livres for the eight men and their horses, while the transfer of the other prisoners cost 936 livres. Allowing for possible extra costs in provisions for prisoners and arms, the estimate of fifty men in the escort seems conservative if anything. Barthès refers only to a 'quantité' of troops. See Amblard to St. Priest, 17 Oct. 1761, A.D.H.G., C. 66; Grenier-Fajal, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

<sup>55</sup> Amblard to St. Priest, 21 and 24 Oct. 1761, A.D.H.G., C. 66.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 28 Oct. 1761, A.D.H.G., C. 66.

<sup>57</sup> Barthès, MS. 703, pp. 55-6.



expected to subside between October 1761 and February 1762, but the security arrangements taken at the execution of Rochette and the Greniers on 19 February show to what an extent it still persisted. Executions at Toulouse normally took place at the Place Saint Georges, a large square which could accommodate the crowds that turned out for these spectacles. For Rochette and the Greniers, however, the Place du Salin immediately outside the Palais enclosure was selected. Much smaller than the other, this square was easily defensible and its size restricted the crowd in attendance to more manageable proportions.

Lust in some and curiosity in others assured full attendance. One of the spectators, a law student, reported that the square held only one-sixth of the persons who wanted to see the hanging and beheadings. The roofs of surrounding houses were filled with people, while places at windows in these houses sold for six livres apiece. This law student and his friends had to appear three hours in advance of the execution to find a spot in the square from which to watch the proceedings. He added that the crowd was swelled by a great many outsiders who had come into Toulouse for the show.<sup>58</sup>

It was just such a spectacle and crowd which the parlement feared. Especially dangerous were those persons from outside Toulouse! How could the judges be sure that these were not Huguenots gathering for one final attempt? With this in mind the officials took every possible precaution. Amblard reported to St. Priest simply that all the troops at Toulouse were under arms.<sup>59</sup> The abbé Lacombe wrote to his father that at noon the two royal army regiments garrisoned at Toulouse marched to the Place du Salin, followed by the troops of the *maréchaussée* and all sixty city police.<sup>60</sup> When the prisoners were put in the carriage to make the traditional trip to St. Etienne cathedral to ask forgiveness for their sins, all the troops went with them with the exception of one royal regiment, which maintained its guard at the scaffold and gallows.<sup>61</sup> On their return the soldiers, armed with rifles and bayonets, were stationed in the square and in the adjoining streets. An inspection was made to see that all guns were loaded and ready.<sup>62</sup> When the executions began at 2 p.m. with the hanging of Rochette, the authorities were ready to receive the attack—an attack which, of course, never came.

It is difficult not to suppose that during the Rochette affair the parlement of Toulouse, reflecting widespread opinion, had temporarily lost its balance on the Protestant issue, and that the excitement, which goes far towards explaining the severity of the sentences, derived from fear. The unfounded alarms that were evident in the treatment of

<sup>58</sup> E. Arnaud, 'Les martyrs de Toulouse (1762). Copie de la lettre d'un étudiant en droit à son frère, abbé dans le Velay', *Bull. Soc. Hist. Prot. Fr.*, xxiii (1874), pp. 279-80.

<sup>59</sup> Amblard to St. Priest, 20 Feb. 1762. A.D.H.G., C. 66.

<sup>60</sup> Abbé Lacombe to father, 19 Feb. 1762, printed in Grenier-Fajal, *op. cit.*, p. 299. See also Barthès, MS. 703, pp. 66-9.

<sup>61</sup> Lacombe to father in Grenier-Fajal, *op. cit.*, p. 290.

<sup>62</sup> Arnaud, *loc. cit.*, p. 280.

Rochette and the Greniers provide the emotional setting for the case of the Calas, proceeding contemporaneously, for Calas and his family had been arrested in October 1761 and judgement was given on 9 March 1762. The result might have been foreseen. Less than three weeks after Rochette and the Greniers died, Jean Calas followed them to the scaffold. Tortured, broken on the wheel, and then after two hours strangled by the executioner in the Place St. Georges, Calas was victim to a Catholic conception of Huguenot fanaticism which was broadened and extended to include parricide as one of its expressions. Only Calas' firmness in refusing to admit to the crime on the rack saved the lives of his wife and son.<sup>63</sup>

The actions of the Catholics at Toulouse, the judges among them, in 1761 and 1762 will never be understood fully by those who see in them simply the expression of a religious prejudice descending unchanged from the burning of the Albigenses to the burning of the remains of Calas. The spirit of religious persecution was not absent, but for the conditions which gave it scope in the case of the Calas, we must look to the specific social, economic and political fears which explain equally the fate of Rochette and the Greniers. Frustrations deriving from an unsuccessful war, together with social and economic dislocations, were focussed for a time on the image of the Protestant as traditionally fanatical, rebellious and sympathetic to the foes of France.

Beginning in 1765, however, only three years after the execution of Calas, his judges themselves were swept along in the movement of ideas which was making religious persecution morally unrespectable. The outspoken and liberal literary pieces selected, chiefly by members of the parlement, for awards and for publication in the annual collection of the Toulousain Academy of Floral Games; the series of judgements, starting in 1769, by which the parlement was to provide Protestants with *de facto* recognition of their marriages and rights of inheritance; the reversal in 1770-1 of the Sirven decision of 1762, made by a lower court in a case that resembled that of Calas—all this bears witness to the rapid growth of a spirit quite unlike that of 1761-2. This surprisingly quick shift in opinion reinforces the view that the burst of anti-Protestant feeling, which took the lives of Calas and Rochette, while deriving in part from feelings based on shared memories of the civil wars and the Camisard revolt, was related also to the specific and transitory anxieties of the period. When the various political, social and economic factors which had contributed to the events declined, the anti-Protestant excitement died down with them.

<sup>63</sup> A.D.H.G., B. 492, 9 and 18 March 1762.

---

# THE HESSIAN MERCENARIES: THE CAREER OF A POLITICAL CLICHÉ

---

H. D. SCHMIDT

THE AMERICAN WAR OF INDEPENDENCE greatly stimulated political journalism in Germany. British and American pamphlets were quickly translated and commented upon. After 1783, however, German interest in America cooled. There was little republican enthusiasm. American ideas of liberty struck most Germans as being too revolutionary. The light of King Frederick II of Prussia, champion of enlightened absolutism, civil order and military efficiency, shone too brightly to allow the American way to recommend itself to the German mind. The impact of the American Revolution on German thought would have been, indeed, of minor importance but for one issue which touched a most sensitive nerve of German life. Britain sent to fight in the American War mercenaries hired in Germany. The Hessians who were shipped across the ocean forced every thinking German to take sides. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that no other political issue had roused the German-speaking population of Europe to such an extent since the Reformation as the 12,000 Hessians and 4000 Brunswickers whom their princes sold to King George III.

The employment of German mercenaries figured for the first time in political debate, not in Germany but in Great Britain, during the early years of George II's reign. After the Treaty of Hanover in 1725 Hessians had been taken into British pay to balance the forces of Austria and Spain. When they were not discharged after the Treaty of Seville had removed Anglo-Spanish tension, the opposition, led by Bolingbroke and Pulteney, in 1728 and the following years used the Hessians as a welcome excuse for attack against Walpole's administration. Bolingbroke's paper, the *Craftsman*, gave prominence to the alleged danger to the country and the constitution resulting from the presence of German mercenaries.<sup>1</sup>

This political controversy was not noticed by the German public at that time except by a keen reader of the *Craftsman*, Crown Prince Frederick of Prussia, who hated his uncle, King George II, for personal reasons. In his early political work, the *Anti-Machiavel*, published in

<sup>1</sup> The *Craftsman*, Nos. 106, 185 and vol., ed. 1731, VI, 315 ff. The *Whitehall Evening Post* 14-17 February 1730.



1740 in its French original and translated in 1741 into German, Frederick condemned those princes who traded in the blood of their subjects and in whose courts troops were sold to the highest bidder. He even criticized his own ancestor, Frederick I, for 'selling the blood of his own people to the English and the Dutch'.<sup>2</sup>

Despite their successful employment on Culloden Moor the Hessians remained an important weapon in the arsenal of the opposition in Britain. Pitt attacked their employment in December 1755, and after the signing of the Treaty of Westminster in 1756, pamphlets opposing the use of foreign troops ranted against public money being squandered in Hesse-Cassel, 'the common Market for supplying the Slaughter Houses of human nature'.<sup>3</sup> When political journalism at last began to come to life in Germany after the Seven Years War, its first representative, Karl Friedrich Moser, pilloried the trade in German mercenaries;<sup>4</sup> but Moser's strong views aroused no echo in his country.

The American War of Independence, however, made the Hessians a focus of national sentiment and public political debate, not only in Britain but for the first time also in Germany. In March 1776 the controversial treaties with Hesse-Cassel and Brunswick were debated in the British Parliament.<sup>5</sup> Soon the cry of the opposition was taken up by the Americans. The climax came when the Continental Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence, which among other things censured George III for his employment of foreign mercenaries 'to compleat the works of death, desolation, and tyranny', and appealed against this to the sympathy of the world. In France an eloquent voice called on the Hessians and other Germans no longer to suffer the use of their citizens as mercenaries by an odious despotism, which would send them abroad to bleed in defence of tyrants and to fight a freedom-loving nation. 'L'Angleterre', Mirabeau wrote in his appeal, 'épuisée d'hommes et d'argent, achète à grands frais de l'argent et des hommes. Vos princes saisissent avidement cette ressource momentanée et ruineuse.'<sup>6</sup> By autumn 1776 the Hessian mercenaries had become a political *cause célèbre* on an international scale.

Frederick II of Prussia once more took up the cause of the Hessians, this time not only in words but also in action. In the summer of 1776, in a letter to Voltaire, he hotly denied having been responsible for the political education of the Landgrave of Hesse. If he had graduated in my school, Frederick emphasized, he would not have sold his subjects to the English 'comme on vend du bétail pour le faire égorger'.<sup>7</sup> Then

<sup>2</sup> *Œuvres de Frédéric le Grand*, Berlin, 1848. i. 142, ii. 152; see also *Die politischen Testamente Friedrichs des Grossen*, Berlin, 1920, p. 46.

<sup>3</sup> *A Sixth Letter to the People of England*, London, 1757; also in 1756 *A Second Letter to the People of England*, and *A Third Letter to the People of England*. See also *London Magazine*, 15 May 1756, and *ibid.*, October 1756, p. 505.

<sup>4</sup> K. F. Moser, *Patriotische Briefe*, 1767, pp. 143, 207, 371.

<sup>5</sup> *The London Chronicle*, No. 3002, p. 230; *Journals of the House of Lords*, March 1776, p. 577.

<sup>6</sup> Mirabeau, *Œuvres*, Paris, 1912, pp. 68-9.

<sup>7</sup> *Publikationen aus den k. Preussischen Archiven*, 1911, p. 389.

the king issued an order forbidding the transit through Prussian territory of all mercenaries hired for the American War. Both Weser and Rhine, the two most obvious routes for the transport of Hessians, flowed through the Prussian territory of Minden and Cleves. In his memoirs the king described how he hampered the passage of German mercenaries deliberately in order to revenge himself for British opposition to the Prussian designs on Danzig,<sup>8</sup> but his contemporaries and the following generations who applauded his action usually gave it a more idealistic interpretation.

Moser's renewed indignation found expression in the political theory which he developed in the years between the American Revolution and the French Revolution. He explained that a prince who sold his subjects for military service abroad forfeited his princely office if he did so without the consent of his state-council and estates.<sup>9</sup> In 1782 the young Schiller immortalized the traffic in German mercenaries to America in his drama *Kabale und Liebe* and so gave the condemnation of the German princes who traded their 'Landeskinder' to foreign countries its place in the classical national literature of Germany. A German description of Britain, published in 1785 in Berlin, linked an account of the slave trade with that in German soldiers as twin examples of British selfishness. It pictured Englishmen complaining about the high cost of a German soldier, for whom £30 had to be paid, while a good ox only fetched £25, and an African slave a mere £8 10s. od.<sup>10</sup> The *Berlinische Monatsschrift* extolled the newly won American freedom in an *Ode to American Liberty* in which prominent reference was made to the 'hired German slaves'.<sup>11</sup>

The rivalry between Prussia and Hanover for leadership in North Germany was reflected in the way Prussians and Hanoverians disagreed over the issue of the Hessians. Hanoverian writers defended the practice of sending German troops to America as vigorously as it was attacked by Prussians. Schlözer's political journal, *Briefwechsel*, sang the praise of the brave Hessians.<sup>12</sup> A comedy published in Göttingen in 1783 made merry over the vicissitudes of a Hessian officer in the American War without showing a trace of political criticism.<sup>13</sup> Detailed apologies were issued justifying the policy of the Landgrave of Hesse. One pamphlet pointed to the long tradition behind the service of German mercenaries and stressed the great financial benefit derived by Hesse from the influx of English money. It had enabled the country to reduce taxes, to found

<sup>8</sup> *Œuvres*, vi. 132.

<sup>9</sup> F. von Moser, *Ueber Regenten, Regierung und Ministers*, Frankfurt am Main, 1784, p. 366; *Ueber die Regierung der geistlichen Staaten in Deutschland*, Frankfurt, 1787, pp. 195, 209. Moser adds, 'Unleugbar ist, dass sichs in der Geister-Welt, wie in der politischen zu grossen Revolutionen zusammenzieht; es ruehrt sich ueberall . . .'

<sup>10</sup> F. A. Wendeborn, *Der Zustand des Staats etc. in Grossbritannien*, Berlin, 1785, pp. 218-19.

<sup>11</sup> *Berlinische Monatsschrift*, i. 388.

<sup>12</sup> *Briefwechsel*, Göttingen, 1780, iii. 264:

'Auf! Auf! ihr Britten auf! Ihr Hessen frischen Muth!  
 Marschirt nur hurtig vor; des Koenigs Sach steht gut . . .'

<sup>13</sup> J. A. W., . . . *Der Hessische Offizier*, Göttingen, 1783.

new villages, and to establish scientific institutes. Hesse, it was explained, was also far from indifferent to the outcome of the American War because of her close ties with the House of Hanover.<sup>14</sup> Wekhrlin's *Chronologen*, too, attempted to justify the policy of Hesse on the ground of ancient tradition.<sup>15</sup> However, the very fact that the policy of the Landgrave of Hesse required an explanation and a justification was significant. No explanation would have been necessary twenty years earlier.

The publication, shortly before the outbreak of the French Revolution, of Frederick II's historical works, with their specific reference to the Hessians and bitter criticism of German rulers<sup>16</sup>—at which a cautious Göttingen reviewer could only hint<sup>17</sup>—added new fuel to political passion. In 1777 Chatham had warned against the incurable resentment the traffic and barter with every little, pitiful German prince would bring about.<sup>18</sup> That 'incurable resentment' which Chatham had foreseen was to be woven into the texture of German thought far more thoroughly and enduringly than he could have divined. The circumstances that had produced a legitimate grievance in Europe and in America were to cease to exist, but the memory and political sentiment generated by the issue lived on. As emotion-rousers and political cant the career of the 'Hessian mercenaries' had only begun.

The French Revolution rapidly revived the memory of the Hessians in its propaganda against absolutism and particularly against Great Britain.<sup>19</sup> Napoleon, too, made use of the same theme in order to promote anti-British sentiment and strengthen the morale of his Continental System. In the eyes of the English, the French-controlled European press proclaimed in every tongue, human blood was but merchandise, as the American War had demonstrated.<sup>20</sup>

In the nineteenth century in Germany the memory of the Hessians was exploited for purposes of domestic politics. The German democratic opposition—in Byronic fashion—depicted the privileged classes and their English aristocratic friends as dealers who bought victories by the use of hirelings in order to maintain their own privileges.<sup>21</sup> German historians such as Poelitz, Menzel, Schlosser and Droysen gave prominence to the story of the German mercenaries in America. Menzel headed it laconically '*Menschenverkauf*'.<sup>22</sup> To the mid-century generation that aspired for German unification, the now familiar historical

<sup>14</sup> *Von den Hessen in Amerika*, an anonymous pamphlet, 1782.

<sup>15</sup> *Chronologen*, 1779, xii. 36, 47.

<sup>17</sup> *Göttingische Anzeigen*, February, 1789, pp. 325, 334.

<sup>18</sup> B. Tunstall, *William Pitt*, London, 1938, p. 467.

<sup>19</sup> E.g. British Museum Collection of French Revolution Pamphlets, R.F.329, XV, 31, 64; R.295, 5; *Moniteur*, 1 August 1793.

<sup>20</sup> R. B. Holtman, *Napoleonic Propaganda*, Baton Rouge, 1950, p. 8.

<sup>21</sup> H. Heine, *Werke*, Hamburg, 1885, vi. 261–62, ix. 266; K. von Rotteck, *Allgemeine Geschichte*, Freiburg, 1835, iii. 468; *Staatslexikon*, Altona, 1847, ix. 631.

<sup>22</sup> W. Wenzel, *Geschichte der Deutschen*, Stuttgart, 1837, p. 897; J. G. Droysen, *Vorlesungen über die Freiheitskriege*, Kiel, 1846, i. 253; K. Poelitz, *Weltgeschichte*, Leipzig, 1830, iv. 393, 698; F. C. Schlosser, *Geschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Heidelberg, 1842, iii. 450–51.

<sup>16</sup> *Œuvres*, ii. 152.



picture of German mercenaries serving foreign interests in America constituted a challenge to national pride and a painful reminder of political impotence. Political writers reminded their readers that German blood had been shed to build not a German but a British empire.<sup>23</sup>

In America itself the memory of the Hessians was revived in the Civil War, when the South branded the troops of the North as 'Hessians'. The heat of battle brought back to the minds of the Americans their first national crisis. To the Southerners Lincoln was George III and his troops were hired mercenaries.<sup>24</sup>

In the new German Empire of Bismarck and William II, the history of the German mercenaries was invoked to give support to the view that Britain, without a strong army, desired Germany to fight her battles for her on the Continent. Bismarck and William II shared this view, while German historians, now in an expansive mood, reiterated the thesis that Britain's colonial empire had been established by German soldiers directly or indirectly fighting for Britain.<sup>25</sup> This stereotyped pattern of thought influenced Holstein, cast its shadow on Anglo-German contacts at the opening of the new century, and remained very much alive in the subsequent years. In the first world war, what had been a traditional cliché became a deliberate piece of German war-propaganda calculated to influence public opinion in the neutral countries and above all in America.<sup>26</sup>

After an interval the theme was revived by the Nazis. Ribbentrop in his historic talks with Molotov and Stalin in August 1939, and the *Völkische Beobachter*, used the argument that Britain needed others to fight for her. Political expediency and propaganda thus exploited a deep-rooted historical sentiment. Even the second world war did not end this history of a cliché, which in its most recent appearance has undergone once again a curious transformation. The issue of German re-armament from 1951 onwards provided a new political background. The application of the old tradition of the German mercenaries was transferred from Britain to America. It was said that America wanted to hire German soldiers with her dollars to fight her battles. This became a prominent theme in the propaganda emitted from East Germany.<sup>27</sup> Thus by the kind of quaint ironical turn of which history is so fond, the old battle-cry

<sup>23</sup> *Preussische Jahrbücher* viii. 274; F. Kapp, *Der Soldatenhandel deutscher Fürsten nach Amerika*, Berlin, 1874.

<sup>24</sup> *Richmond Dispatch*, 19 June, 31 July, 16 August 1861, 5 May 1862.

<sup>25</sup> W. Goetz, *Briefe Wilhelm II an den Zaren*, 1920, p. 311; R. Du Moulin-Eckart, *Englands Politik und die Mächte*, München, 1901, p. 37; *Preussische Jahrbücher* lxxxiii. 394, lxxxv. 117; H. v. Treitschke, *Deutsche Geschichte*, Engl. ed. London, 1915, ii. 188, 191.

<sup>26</sup> E. Fischer, *Holsteins grosses Nein*, Berlin, 1925, p. 200; G. von Schulze-Gaevernitz, *The Real England*, New York, 1915; *Standard Union*, 5 May 1916; *The Viereck-Chesterton Debate*, New York, 1915, p. 12; *Viereck's American Weekly*, 13 June 1917; A. v. Tirpitz, *Erinnerungen*, Leipzig, 1919, pp. 18, 56.

<sup>27</sup> *Völkische Beobachter*, 25 August 1939; J. Goebbels, *Die Zeit ohne Beispiel*, München, 1941, pp. 108, 151; *Der steile Aufstieg*, München, 1944, pp. 62, 65. For post-war propaganda, *Neues Deutschland*, 16 February 1951, 21 August 1952, 23 October 1951. It played a part as recently as the letter sent by Marshal Bulganin to the German Chancellor on the eve of the Nato meeting in December 1957. *The Times*, 12 December 1957, p. 10.

raised by the American colonists almost two centuries earlier was now being used not for but against their descendants. In this way the impact of the Hessian mercenaries in the American War of Independence on German thought may be said to have survived even to the present day.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>28</sup> For the study of the long life and career of another political cliché, see my article 'The Idea and Slogan of "Perfidious Albion"', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, October 1953, pp. 606-16.

---

## EDITORIAL NOTES

---

HISTORIANS IN THE PRESENT CENTURY have usually been content to practise their art and leave the discussion of what it is to others; but recently some of them have ventured into the field of philosophical discussion, at least to the extent of hurling charges of 'historicism' about, until this term has become little more than an expression of abuse for any kind of history that one does not like. Professor Karl Popper, in *THE POVERTY OF HISTORICISM*,<sup>1</sup> gives it a more specific meaning. For him it is 'an approach to the social sciences which assumes that *historical prediction* is their principal aim, and that this aim is attainable by discovering the "rhythms" or the "patterns", the "laws" or the "trends" that underlie the evolution of history'.<sup>2</sup> This approach, he admits, is comprehensible as a reaction against that type of 'naïve history' which does not attempt any detailed analysis of situations,<sup>3</sup> but it is none the less dangerous. For the historicist, the course of historical development, though it can be speeded up or retarded, cannot be changed.<sup>4</sup> It obeys absolute laws, on which are based unconditional prophecies of the future.<sup>5</sup> Conceived in this way, as a pseudo-science, history becomes a powerful instrument of political action, as the Marxist movement shows; but Professor Popper demonstrates forcefully its intellectual defects. Historicism, he says, envisages the life of mankind as a single, continuous and all-embracing stream; which is fatal to its claim to scientific truth, for a scientific law cannot be validated by a single instance.<sup>6</sup> Besides, since the growth of knowledge influences the course of history, and there is no scientific method of predicting the future progress of science, we cannot foretell the future course of history.<sup>7</sup> Trends, of course, there may be, but these essentially depend on and change with circumstances.<sup>8</sup> The categories of the historicists, on the other hand, are fixed theoretical constructions. When Marx writes of a social class, or Professor Toynbee of a civilization, they define them in terms of their *a priori* beliefs.<sup>9</sup> From the beginning, we may say, they have rigged the pack of cards with which they are playing, and they will always win the game so long as they can play with their own pack.

It may fairly be said that Professor Popper's argument is directed rather to the social scientist or the philosopher of history than to the historian; and this is appropriate, because nearly all philosophers and social scientists try to force historical thought into alien channels. Even Professor Popper is not free from this tendency. He seems to hold that explanation is only achieved in history, as elsewhere, by 'subsuming' what is to be explained under a general law.<sup>10</sup> This view is widely held by modern analytical philosophers,

<sup>1</sup> London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1957. 166 pp. 16s.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 148.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 52.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 128.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 81, 108.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. ix-x.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 115, 128.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 33-4, 111.

<sup>10</sup> Popper, *The Open Society*, ii. 262.



who were preceded in it by Comte and Mill.<sup>11</sup> It was elaborated in *The Nature of Historical Explanation* (1952) by Mr. P. Gardiner, and a recent plea for scientific history is that of Dr. Philip Bagby in *CULTURE AND HISTORY* (London: Longmans, 1958. 244 pp. 30s.). In place of concentrating attention on individuals and their actions, which Dr. Bagby regards as 'the major reason why history has proved unintelligible up to date',<sup>12</sup> he wants the historian to observe recurrent patterns or regularities. His theme is that the historian must copy the methods of the cultural anthropologist, for culture is 'history's intelligible aspect'.<sup>13</sup> When Dr. Bagby tries to indicate the results to be expected from scientific history he hardly gets beyond an elementary text-book level. Nevertheless the belief that history can only be understood in terms of laws or regularities is something which historians should not shut their eyes to. This view is criticized in the Riddell Memorial Lectures for 1957<sup>14</sup> by Dr. H. G. Wood. Mr. W. H. Walsh's *Introduction to the Philosophy of History* (1951) also qualified the positivistic approach to historical explanation.

It has now been subjected to a full-scale critique in *LAWS AND EXPLANATION IN HISTORY* by Professor William Dray, whose book offers what looks like a way out of the *impasse* in which historians would find themselves if they knew what philosophers have been writing about them. The positivists insist that historians can only talk about causes in terms of 'covering laws'. On the other hand, some idealists would remove the conception of cause altogether from history, and replace it by 'the exhibition of a world of events intrinsically related to one another in which no *lacuna* is tolerated'. This seems to demand a total history which no historian could envisage or achieve. Nor indeed will any historian easily be persuaded that he must not discuss causes, in some sense or other of the word, though he might willingly agree that it is not necessarily the sense in which many philosophers use the term, and applaud Professor Dray when he says that to hold the view 'that no explanation is complete until a lurking covering law has been discovered is merely to fall into a kind of determinist myopia'.<sup>15</sup> Admittedly, the historian, like anyone who has to communicate his thoughts, uses classificatory terms; but so long as he remains 'at the level of generality indicated by his classificatory word', he does not achieve history.<sup>16</sup>

Mr. Dray, it seems to me, has made a valuable contribution to the clarification of our ideas on historical explanation. This is perhaps not unconnected with the fact that his description of it bears, for a philosopher, an unusually recognizable relation to the activity in which historians know themselves to be engaged. There are also some interesting observations, though rather widely spaced, in the historical part of *NATURE AND HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE*<sup>17</sup> by John Herman Randall, Jr. Professor Randall points out that history implies novelty, and therefore discontinuity as well as continuity. He criticizes 'historicism' as the assumption of a vital force at work in history, and sees philosophies of history as primarily attempts to appraise the present and what is dynamic in it, rather than the past. The major part of his book,

<sup>11</sup> For illustrations, see William Dray, *Laws and Explanations in History*, Oxford University Press, 1957. 174 pp. 21s.

<sup>12</sup> *Culture and History*, p. 150

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 124; cf. pp. 57, 71.

<sup>14</sup> *Freedom and Necessity in History*. Oxford University Press, 1957. 68 pp. 6s.

<sup>15</sup> Dray, p. 168.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>17</sup> Columbia University Press: Oxford University Press, 1958. 326 pp. 45s.

however, is devoted to the discussion of a theory of nature, and what he has to say about history, though sound, is rather slight.

Of course, one must not exaggerate the importance of theories about history. Philosophical views do not commonly have an immediate or direct effect on historical writing. Those historians who imagine themselves to be the purest devotees of the fact 'as it actually happened', however, are likely to be those who are most at the mercy of preconceived and unexamined theoretical assumptions. And changes in the intellectual climate have an indirect effect on historians, of which they themselves are often largely unconscious. It may be suspected that we are now in the midst of a period of such change, and that some of the present doubts and hesitations, and even contradictions, about what history ought to be, are not unconnected with this fact.

\* \* \*

The flow of school books being rather uneven, and an adequate number for a review article arriving too late in the summer for treatment in the present issue, *History Books for Schools: V* has been held over and will be printed in February 1959.

\* \* \*

The lists of school books which used to be printed annually have been discontinued because it has been found that most of the books that would be included are already noticed in 'History Books for Schools'. For the sake of completeness it seems desirable to add a few books that have not been sent for review. I am indebted to Mr. F. E. Manning for the following additional titles.

To the list for 1956 may be added:

Dartford, G. P. A., *A Short History of Malaya*. London: Longmans. 200 pp. illus. 8s. 6d.

Palmer, G. B. and Armstrong, H. W., *In the Public Interest*. Glasgow: Blackie. illus. 8s.

Pearson, H. F., *A History of Singapore*. London: University of London Press. 192 pp. illus. 5s.

Reeves, Margaret E., *Elizabethan Court* (Then and There Series.) London: Longmans. 92 pp. illus. 3s.

Robinson, G., *Elizabethan Ship*. (Then and There Series.) London: Longmans. 58 pp. illus. 3s.

And for 1957:

Doncaster, Mrs. Islay, *Finding the History Around Us*. Oxford: Blackwell. xvi + 216 pp. illus. 17s. 6d.

\* \* \*

The Editor wishes to express his gratitude to the Assistant Editor and to Dr. Winifred Edington for conducting the editorial task so efficiently during his absence for the first six months of 1958.

\* \* \*

CORRECTION:—The book JAMES K. POLK, *JACKSONIAN*, reviewed in *History*, vol. xliii, no. 148, pp. 110 ff., is by Charles Grier Sellers Jun., and not James K. Sellers.

---

## REVIEWS AND SHORT NOTICES

---

### ANCIENT

ANCIENT LANDSCAPES: STUDIES IN FIELD ARCHÆOLOGY. By John Bradford.

London: Bell. 1957. xvii + 297 pp., 75 plates, 25 text figs. £4 4s.

This is the work of an enthusiast, and indeed archæology through air photography (which is its subject) is a theme which can clearly lead easily to enthusiasm. It is a comparatively new idea, initiated by the late O. G. S. Crawford, and is closely linked to reconnaissance by air photography in war, in which the author of this book got his first experience of the technique. The explorer and adventurer who lie hid, or scarcely hid, in so many archæologists, find ample scope in this field, whether in distant deserts or the home counties. No one can look at the profuse and excellent photographs in this book without seeing the fascination of layers of the past revealed about us simply by rising a little way into the air; and the fascination is only deepened by realizing the infinite patience and long training in a difficult skill which allow the expert to interpret this revelation truly. The technique has a number of different uses in archæology. The most immediately obvious perhaps are in the identification of areas which will repay excavation, and in mapping. More deeply significant, however, is the help it gives in enlarging and unifying our picture of the physical and economic setting of a given point in time and space: we see a farm or settlement in relation to its fields, a city in relation to the countryside which supports it; the pattern of life repeated or varied in different places and times. The technique has its uses, too, in the no less important though now unfashionable side of archæology, the unearthing of intrinsically interesting and beautiful objects. In a fascinating chapter Mr. Bradford describes how air photography has revealed some 2000 levelled tumuli in Southern Etruria; and in a postscript tells how a method has been discovered of drilling into the chambers of the tombs so found and photographing them as they were left after the interment. The museums of the world are filled with the loot of Etruscan cemeteries, their contexts and circumstances of discovery largely unrevealed. By these new methods many more such treasures should be recovered, together with impeccable documentation.

'This book', Mr. Bradford writes, 'does not aim to catalogue *all* the present and future potentialities and techniques within the scope of Air Archæology, but enough to suffice for its practical purpose: to facilitate the recovery of ancient landscapes comprehensively over large areas.' After a long introductory chapter (Air Archæology: its purpose and practice) in which his illustrations range from Bronze Age Persia to medieval Ireland, four particular cases are taken on which the author has himself worked: Neolithic Apulia; Etruscan cemeteries; Roman land-partition (illustrations from



North Italy, Dalmatia, Tunisia and France); and a study in the changing character of urban civilization in Europe through the recovery and comparison of classical and medieval town-plans. The author's style is somewhat diffuse and unpruned—the book seems unnecessarily long—but agreeably personal. It is, taken all together, an impressive presentation of a most interesting subject.

*University College, London*

MARTIN ROBERTSON

ATHENIAN DEMOCRACY. By A. H. M. Jones. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1957. viii + 198 pp. 21s.

This book is composed of three very welcome reprints of articles in none-too-accessible periodicals and an Inaugural Lecture, with the addition of a chapter not published before, entitled 'How did the Athenian Democracy Work?', and an Appendix on the citizen population of Athens during the Peloponnesian War. Professor Jones has always been characterized by his originality of approach, and by his capacity to emancipate himself from the influence of commonly prevailing and poorly supported conceptions. Nowhere is this clearer than in this book, which should be compulsory reading for those numerous persons given to ill-considered observations on this important subject. If they are Greekless, the text will present them with no difficulties; if they wish to check and follow up the points made by him, they will find the full notes given for each chapter to be of outstanding value.

Broadly speaking it may be said that the problems which arise from a consideration of the Athenian democracy are clear. What was the apportionment of power between the various instruments of government, the magistrates, the council, the assembly and the courts, and what shifts of power were there, from the period of the Cleisthenic democracy of the late sixth century, through the radical democracy of the Periclean and Peloponnesian War periods, down to the restored democracy of 403 B.C., which was tested in the straitened times of the fourth century and by the struggle with Macedon? What was the economic status and outlook of those who participated in the working of these instruments of government, and how was Athenian policy influenced in consequence? Above all, was the government of Athens a broad-based oligarchy rather than a democracy, the pensioner, from Persian War to Peloponnesian War, of the Delian League (which became a collection of hostile subjects), and sustained by a horde of slaves? Were the critics of Athens right when they called her poorer citizens 'salaried paupers', and condemned the working of the democracy as corrupt, partisan and disorderly?

It is clear that the answer to most of these questions must rest on social and economic considerations. It is unfortunate that we possess singularly little in the way of statistics. This is seen to be true of epigraphical as well as literary sources when a quest is made for unambiguous information. Similarly the study of the identity and economic status of individuals is far less practical than even in Republican Rome, though membership of the Council is being actively studied at the present moment, and may yield some information. Furthermore the Greeks seem to have understood little and cared less about economic principles. What information there is has been used with great skill and judgement by Professor Jones, who leaves the reader in no doubt about the ambiguity of much of the evidence, and stresses in salutary fashion the obscurities of interpretation attaching to the mechanism of assessment for the

financial contributions which were such a feature of the last years of the Peloponnesian War and the fourth century. He warns, too, against the uncritical use of the Orators, who wrote for rich men, as sources of evidence. Equally he avoids Aristophanes as a source of serious information on social and economic themes.

In nearly all cases his arguments are convincingly marshalled and striking in their import. The cost to the state of payment for civilian public service, so often held to depend on the revenues of the Athenian Empire, he shows to be no vast sum. He asserts (as, indeed, others have done) that paid public service attracted only a section of the citizen body, in view of the competition exercised by the rate of wages available in private callings. Here, of course, he is excluding the evidence of Aristophanes, who, in dealing with this subject in connection with jurymen's fees and Assembly pay, might, on an admittedly subjective interpretation, be taken to indicate otherwise. Perhaps, too, Professor Jones has taken too little account of periodic unemployment and the effects of piece-work. On the problem of slavery he dismisses any suggestion of very large numbers being employed in Athens and Attica. Some Athenians may have owned moderate numbers whom they hired out or employed in house industry; most citizens had very few or none. The evidence is uncertain (the position of the Laurion silver mines and the degree of their development is by no means clear), and calculations based on cereal consumption are perhaps a little dubious, but the balance of probability is on Professor Jones's side, and seems confirmed by the fact that the essential basis of the Athenian economy was land-cultivation which cannot have employed great numbers of slaves even for vine and olive culture. Not unconnected with this problem is the question how the Athenians paid for their large imports of food-stuffs in the fourth century. The export of silver is not the easy way out which Professor Jones seems to think it is, in view of the irregular working of the mines. The suggestion of invisible exports in the form of banking, money-lending and shipping presents considerable difficulties also. In stressing the importance of cultivation and land-owning Professor Jones is certainly correct, and his demonstration that landed property and wealth in general was more widely distributed than is sometimes thought, accounts for the relative stability of the fourth-century Athenian democracy.

In his chapter on the Athens of Demosthenes, Professor Jones examines the effects of the incidence of military service (with its economic aspects) and taxation on the various grades of Athenian citizens. Here he reaches two conclusions which many will find startling: first, that the burden of such service and taxation bore more heavily on the lower ranks of property owners, and, second, that the Assembly and the Courts in the Demosthenic period were largely the province of the richer citizens. This latter conclusion seems indicated from time to time by Demosthenes' mode of address to the Assembly, and seems to be supported by the uncompetitive nature of the jurymen's fee, at any rate, in comparison to wages which might be earned in other ways. It is, of course, also true that attendance in the Assembly seems to have been unwilling, if this is the true explanation of payment for it. None the less one still wonders about the effects both of variations in the amount of other employment available, and of the seasonal nature of cultivation, on the willingness of the citizen to attend the Courts. There is also the matter of the early hour at which the Assembly met: was it not possible to

combine both attendance at the Assembly and a day's work, especially in the case of piece-workers? Professor Jones makes out a better case for his first contention than for his second; it might be asked, if the first is true, why there was not better attendance in the Assembly with a view to securing policies favourable to the poorer man? The argument for non-attendance because of the technical nature of the business transacted (which would be equally true of the Courts) is a dubious one, and unworthy of the ancient democracy with its training in local affairs.

Finally it appears that Professor Jones thinks the Athenian democracy functioned pretty well. One question he has left largely untouched. Is there evidence for a decline in public spirit in the fourth century apart from the principle of pay for attendance at the Assembly? How soon did the decline of the *polis* spirit set in, the trend expressed in the Latin tag 'ubi bene, ibi patria', when the *oikoumene* and the individual seemed more important than the *polis* community?

University of Sheffield

R. J. HOPPER

A HISTORY OF ROME, FROM ITS ORIGINS TO A.D. 529, AS TOLD BY THE ROMAN HISTORIANS, prepared by Moses Hadas (London: G. Bell and Sons. 1958. viii + 232 pp. 18s. 6d.), consists of extracts from the ancient historians, translated by the author, and linked up by interpretative passages. The content of the extracts is not discussed critically, since the primary object of the author is to summarize the tradition of the Romans themselves about their history and to give their interpretation and the form in which they transmitted it to posterity. The material is divided roughly into three equal parts: the Republic, the Early Empire, and the Empire from Diocletian to Justinian. The idea is good and the book makes pleasant and interesting reading, but it is a pity that the linking commentary is marred by many gross errors of fact.

King's College, London

H. H. SCULLARD

ROMAN IMPERIAL CIVILISATION. By H. Mattingly. London: Edward Arnold. 1957. 312 pp. 35s.

Sir William Tarn's distinguished *Hellenistic Civilisation* and Sir Stephen Runciman's *Byzantine Civilisation*, both published by E. Arnold, are now linked together by Mr. Mattingly's new volume which deals with the varied aspects of the Roman Empire from Augustus to the fall of the Western Empire. Some of the difficulties involved in tackling such a task are discussed in the Introduction, where the author's canons of criticism are also briefly expounded. He has tried to 'draw a number of pictures of different phases of the Empire . . . and to indicate . . . how they can be fitted together to form the general view'. His chapters comprise a historical sketch of the period; the Empire and its parts; cities and citizenship; the outside world; the imperial civil service (on which he wrote a monograph in his earlier days); the army; private and social life; economic life; religion and philosophy; literature and art. A brief, but curiously unworthy, bibliography follows: Rostovtzeff and T. Frank do not qualify for mention under 'Economic Life', while in a book designed for English readers, it would have been more appropriate to have given the titles of the English translations of several German works that are listed (especially as Mr. Mattingly himself was responsible for one). Two 'personal' aspects of the work are noticeable. Since much of the author's



contribution to knowledge has been made in the field of numismatics, he naturally emphasizes the ways in which the study of coins supplements and illustrates historical knowledge—which is all to the good. And in dealing with a civilization which was in decline yet clung to the idea of its *æternitas* (though, as he points out, the Romans in general lived too much under the spell of the past and cared too little for the future), he is very conscious of the challenge of the events of the world today and tends to reflect on moral issues too much. The chapters on religion, philosophy and economic life are sympathetically handled; that on literature is somewhat sketchy, while the one on art manages to avoid mention of the *Ara Pacis*. In general, we are given a readable survey which forms a good introduction to a large subject.

King's College, London

H. H. SCULLARD

## MEDIEVAL

THE INTELLECTUAL HERITAGE OF THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES. By M. L. W.

Laistner. Cornell University Press. London: O.U.P. 1957. xvii + 285 pp.

40s.

By happy coincidence the year which saw the publication of Professor Laistner's revised *Thought and Letters* sees also the publication in book form of a notable selection of his articles and reviews, edited, in honour of his sixty-seventh birthday, by Dr. Chester G. Starr. It is good, too, to be provided with a short biographical preface that places Professor Laistner's work firmly and affectionately in the context of his life, and with a bibliography of his publications.

The title chosen for this selection is perhaps misleading, since it conjures up hopes of just such an integrated study as Professor Laistner alone could give us. Even so, what is given us—though none of it is, or should be, unfamiliar—is a revelation of integrated learning that places it on a level with Baynes' *Byzantine Studies*, Sisam's *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* and, most relevantly, of Levison's *Aus Rheinischer und Fränkischer Frühzeit*. Like these great scholars, Laistner achieves his best effects by applying the full force of his technique to a carefully-delimited problem. One's delight in a technical mastery so clean and incisive is surpassed only by the pleasure of discovering yet again that when one has finished with High History and Hack History there remains Real History. This is it.

The papers are grouped into three sections. The first, 'Christianity and the Past', includes an important study of Cassiodorus, a long review of E. R. Curtius' *Europäischer Literatur* and 'Some Reflections on Latin Historical Writing in the Fifth Century'. All three are held together by Laistner's insistence on systematic study of manuscripts and of surviving medieval library catalogues. It was the weakness of Curtius that he tried to assess the popularity of medieval writings and to explain continuity of interest in them without using the proper tools for the task. The fine study of Latin historical writing is, in my opinion, a little marred by the severity of the author's judgement on Orosius. He is right to insist on Orosius' inaccuracy with sources; it is horrible; but I do not think that this entitles us to cast general doubt upon his use of oral tradition or to suppose that when Orosius says *ut aiunt* or *ut fertur* we are faced with vagueness exceeding that of, say, Gregory of Tours or any other narrative writer of the age. Further, it is

dangerous to argue that because Orosius calls himself an historian and is, in fact, an apologist, he becomes in some special sense unreliable. It depends what you think Orosius meant by 'historian'. Who will draw the line between history and historical apologetic in the early Middle Ages?

The second section is devoted to Bede. It is a great convenience to have these four articles brought together, both because it gives one a clearer insight into the author's approach to Bede, and because the best of them—'The Library of the Venerable Bede'—first appeared in a book that has long been impossible to obtain. When one sees the full extent of Bede's reading, or something like it, one is bound to ask whether, some day, an attempt might be made to assess what he owed to particular parts of the continent. I think of the Gaul that St. Wilfrid and Benedict Biscop knew, with its great literary resources. Attention should specially be drawn to a less well-known study, 'Was Bede the Author of a Penitential?' Professor Laistner's arguments against Bede's authorship stop short of absolute proof; but the way in which the cumulative evidence is massed is striking, and he shows what sort of man might, and might not, have composed a penitential.

The final section contains three papers on the Carolingian age. The first considers some commentaries on the Old Testament, and shows why the source-problems raised are far more intricate than they look at first glance; the second examines the popularity in the Carolingian scriptoria of the writings of Fulgentius the mythographer and Fulgentius the bishop; and the subject of the third is Christian of Stavelot, commentator on St. Matthew. It is worth quoting Professor Laistner's translation of the beginning of Christian's dedicatory epistle:

'I have aimed to follow the historic rather than the allegoric (*spiritalem*) meaning, because it seems to me illogical to look for an allegorical understanding in any book and to ignore the historical utterly; for history is the foundation of all intelligence and we must seek her from the first and embrace her, and without her we cannot successfully pass on to other knowledge.'

And what is this history? Professor Laistner thinks that we know already; but I am not at all sure that I do. The book concludes with a fine appreciation of Richard Bentley, and with two long reviews, one of Rostovtzeff's *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, the other of Marrou's *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*. Both deserve to be included, for both are models of what good historical reviewing can be like: they state the contents of the books reviewed, they assess the place of the books in the literature of the subject, and they advance thought; and this without fear, favour or vanity. May Professor Laistner long continue to teach us these lessons.

University of Manchester

J. M. WALLACE-HADRILL

THE ORIGINS OF OWNERSHIP. By D. R. Denman. London: Allen and Unwin. 1958. 190 pp. 22s. 6d.

According to the subtitle, this book is a 'brief history of land ownership and tenure from earliest times to the modern era'. The book is, in fact, a guide to the history of English land tenure up to the end of the middle ages. Its author is writing mainly for students 'reading for the many professions concerned with landownership and use'. Accordingly Mr. Denman has made no attempt to be original but has endeavoured instead to summarize

authoritative opinions on the main problems with which he deals. Since these include the rise and decline of the manor, the history of private jurisdiction and the complexities of early English and feudal tenure, it will be apparent that Mr. Denman has attempted a formidable task. Mostly he has acquitted himself well; his style of writing and thinking is lucid and he has acquainted himself with all but the latest work on his subject. He is, however, rather incurious about both continental parallels and foreign literature. This means that he has used neither Professor Levy's work on vulgar roman law, which must materially affect all our notions of the nature of bookland and its relation to folkland, nor Herr Dannebauer's study of the continental hundred which seems to me to give the true answer to 'the problem of the hundred'—that it was primarily a military thing. Nor does Mr. Denman quite avoid contradicting himself—the 'Germanic theory' of the origin of English society is not really compatible with Chadwick's view of the nature and consequences of the Anglo-Saxon invasions, yet Mr. Denham wishes to hold both opinions. We must not, of course, blame Mr. Denham too much here. We have not yet achieved a coherent and plausible account of Anglo-Saxon society and it is not the least of Mr. Denham's merits that he shows how far from final are the conclusions so far reached by scholars. Within its chosen limits and for the purpose for which it is intended, his book is a good one.

*University of Manchester*

ERIC JOHN

CATALOGUE OF MANUSCRIPTS CONTAINING ANGLO-SAXON. By N. R. Ker.  
Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1957. lxiv + 567 pp. 105s.

The amount of Old English literature which has survived is comparatively small, and it has been the subject of much textual and linguistic study. In embarking upon a description of all manuscripts written before A.D. 1200, except cartularies and single sheet documents, which contain any writing in Old English, Mr. Ker has thus been left free, without neglecting the wider responsibilities of a cataloguer, to concentrate the main weight of his attention upon a critical examination of the manuscripts themselves, as physical objects. The result is a striking demonstration of the extent to which study of the way in which such books are written, put together, and subsequently used, can contribute in skilful hands to the proper understanding of their contents. His catalogue is a masterly corpus of precisely observed, lucidly marshalled, and astringently presented information (much of it entirely new) which will at once establish itself as a basic work of reference in all the higher fields of Anglo-Saxon scholarship. The Introduction offers a stimulating and deceptively easy approach to the many problems of Anglo-Saxon palæography. An elaborate bibliography, indexes of the contents and owners of manuscripts, and a palæographical and historical index, provide convenient points of entry to those in search of information on specific subjects. Historians will welcome the book particularly as a guide to the miscellaneous historical records and memoranda that are to be found written in blank spaces in Gospel-Books and other similarly elusive places, here brought together for the first time. Students of Anglo-Saxon charters, despite the exclusion of these from its scope, will ignore at their peril the implications which it holds for them.

*British Museum*

G. R. C. DAVIS



Students of medieval Scottish history have waited long and eagerly for the late Dr. D. E. Easson's *MEDIEVAL RELIGIOUS HOUSES, SCOTLAND* (London: Longmans, 1957. 204 pp., with three maps, by R. Neville Hadcock. 45s.). Their expectations are more than fulfilled by this learned and masterly catalogue, which will, indeed, be prized by a much wider circle of scholars and others, by medievalists, ecclesiastical historians, ecclesiologists, and not least by the enquiring tourist, who often visits monastic sites only to be baffled by the lack of easily obtained information about them. The book follows the plan of its famous sister-volume by Professor Knowles and Mr. Hadcock, but the very much smaller number of houses involved has fortunately given Dr. Easson the opportunity for considerably fuller critical apparatus. Because of the lack of any serious Scottish equivalent of Dugdale, this detailed treatment is particularly necessary, and many of Dr. Easson's footnotes, e.g. on Crossraguel, May and Pittenweem, Souleseat and St. Andrews, are really short essays crammed with valuable information and references which everywhere display the author's painstaking scholarship and whose collection occupied him for many years. In addition to the sections devoted to the orders of monks (here one notices the Scottish preponderance of the 'reformed' Benedictines), canons-regular, friars, nuns and canonesses (how few were the Scottish houses for women relative to the English!), military orders, hospitals (this an especially valuable pioneer work), cathedral and other secular collegiate foundations, and Celtic houses, there is a most useful section on 'Doubtful and rejected foundations', as well as appendices on religious houses in the Isle of Man and the income of Scottish monasteries. Dr. Easson's book at once takes its place beside Dowden's *Bishops* and Dr. Anderson's *Early Sources* as a quite indispensable work of reference for the history of the Scottish medieval church. The death of its author shortly after the book appeared is a grievous loss for the study of Scottish history.

*University College, London*

G. W. S. BARROW

*THE ESTATES OF RAMSEY ABBEY.* By J. A. Raftis. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies. 1957. xvii + 341 pp. \$7.00.

This is a very important addition to the monograph studies of medieval estates which are the necessary foundation for our knowledge of the agrarian economy. In it Professor Raftis examines in great detail the evolution of the Ramsey estates from the period of foundation until the fifteenth century. It is primarily a history of the management of the demesnes, much less a history of the peasants, and although there is a good deal about the twelfth-century tenurial settlement, the emphasis is largely economic—'in the rare and exacting sense of the adjective', says Professor Postan in his introduction. However, there appears to be some confusion about one of the most important aspects of agrarian economy, the investment of capital. The author's sense of distinction between land and capital as factors of production seems somewhat dim, and in a book crammed with statistical tables there is remarkably little information about the relationship of labour costs to total production costs. But there is an immense amount of information about most of the important aspects of estate history, though style and presentation are by no means easy. It is a 'must' for all serious students of medieval society.

*University of Birmingham*

R. H. HILTON

FREDERICK II OF HOHENSTAUFEN: A LIFE. By Georgina Masson. London:

Secker and Warburg. 1957. 376 pp. 35s.

As so often happens with biography, an amateur has rushed in where professors fear to tread. This is picturesque, superficial history, complete with dancing-girls, 'gardens heavy with scent', and the 'golden sunlight of the deep south'. The author has tried to come to grips with the political aspects of Frederick II's reign, but there are no short cuts in these matters and her unfamiliarity with the age and the sources from which its history can be written is evident. In place of judgements we are given the unilluminating *cliché* of the man 'fighting the mentality of his own age', so that when Rome resists Frederick in 1240 the Romans are motivated not by their knowledge of the emperor's policy towards the communes, but by the fact that 'in the thirteenth century Gregory and all he stood for was nearer to the hearts and minds of the Roman crowd than all the glamour of the *Stupor Mundi*'. The book is written in a style heavy with *clichés*, and there are errors even in the genealogical table. It is sad that the cloudy myth of Kantorowicz should be succeeded by the shallow trivialities of Miss Masson. This work will give pleasure to many, but anyone seeking an intelligent and informed account of the subject must still turn to Edouard Jordan's *L'Allemagne et l'Italie aux 12e et 13e siècles* and the long introductory chapter of his *Origines de la Domination Angevine en Italie*.

London School of Economics

D. P. WALEY

TREATY ROLLS PRESERVED IN THE PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE. vol. i, 1234-1325. Edited by Pierre Chaplais. H.M.S.O. 1955. 301 pp. 63s.

Recent years have seen a growth of interest in medieval English diplomatic history, and Professor Cuttino and Dr. Chaplais among others have added notably to our knowledge of the foreign policy and diplomatic methods of the Plantagenet kings. One result of this activity has been to emphasize the dependence of scholars for many of their essential documents on the selections made by Rymer and printed in the three editions of the *Fœdera*. This is the first volume of a new Record Office series designed to supply the need for an authoritative text of the surviving records: it will ultimately include not only the Treaty Rolls but also the Roman Rolls and the Record Office class known as Diplomatic Documents (Exchequer and Chancery). More than half the documents in this volume have appeared in the *Fœdera* and a handful of others in the works of Prynne or modern scholars: references to these published versions are given throughout. It is a testimony to Rymer's industry and accuracy that many of his copies require no correction or merely trifling alterations, and such documents Dr. Chaplais has briefly calendared in English. Otherwise a full text is provided, often collated with drafts or the sealed 'originals' where they survive. A full index supplies separate entries for Latin and French place- and personal-names with cross-references to their modern forms, where they can be identified, but there are occasional capricious omissions. The remarkable royal style of Alfonso X of Castile presents him (in no. 172) as king of nine provinces, which are not separately indexed: most of them are obvious enough (e.g. 'legionis', 'Toleti'), but the reader might have been spared the search necessary to identify 'Gehennis' with Jaen. The subject-entries in the index might with advantage have been extended. But these are small blemishes in an otherwise

admirable edition. The usefulness of this volume, both for the specialist and for readers with more general interests, will be greatly increased when we have Dr. Chaplais' promised introduction to the whole series, for few can move at ease through the technicalities of medieval diplomacy without the skilled guidance which he is so well-equipped to provide. Let us hope that it will not be long delayed.

*University of Bristol*

G. D. ROSS

THE CHURCH IN CHESTER, 1300-1540. By Douglas Jones. Manchester:

The Chetham Society, third series, vol. vii. 1957. xii + 209 pp. 35s.

This scholarly volume will appeal not only to those interested in the history of Cheshire or of the Church, but also to students of the later middle ages in general. The author's detailed learning on the education, character, constitutional disputes and economic position of the Chester clergy is thoroughly informed by the vision that ecclesiastical history in the middle ages is not an isolated study but one way of viewing society, seeing that the Church, as Stephen Gardiner wrote, 'consisteth of the same sorts of people at this day that are comprised in this word, Realm . . .' Mr. Jones is particularly interesting on family connections and financial expedients. The last chapter, on 'Popular Religion', seems the least satisfactory one.

*Bedford College, London*

F. R. H. DU BOULAY

In his introduction to *MOTIVES OF WEST RUSSIAN NOBLES IN DESERTING LITHUANIA FOR MOSCOW 1377-1514* (Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press. 1957. 174 pp. \$5) Professor Oswald Backus expresses a belief in the need 'to discover what influence the Chinese, the tribes of Siberia, many Turkish tribes, the Persians and others have had on the later development of Russian institutions and ideas'. As his own contribution to this fantastic programme, he has chosen to investigate the impact of West Russians (inhabitants of the Lithuanian-White Russian state) 'upon Muscovite institutions and ideas'. Instead, however, of looking for such influence as West Russian nobles may (or may not) have exercised in Muscovy (that is reserved for a later volume), he now chooses to examine the motives of those who deserted to Moscow. Motives are notoriously difficult to establish, especially where the evidence is scanty. From much speculation and surmise (in a none the less scholarly study) emerges the conclusion—anticipated on the author's own showing by the Russian historian Liubavsky—that the changes of allegiance in the border region were in many cases a reaction against centralizing tendencies in the Lithuanian state. It may be pertinent to ask a question Backus does not examine, whether nobles transferring their allegiance either found, or expected to find, greater freedom under Ivan III than they enjoyed under Casimir IV. In general this study, not without some interest in itself, would have benefited greatly from being placed in a wider historical setting.

*University of Glasgow*

W. E. MOSSE

DANTE AND THE IDEA OF ROME. By C. T. Davis. London: O.U.P. 1957.

302 pp. 30s.

One does not know which to admire most in this very fine book by Professor Davis, of Tulane University, New Orleans, whether it is his mastery of the



literature, his sensitivity towards the subtleties of the subject, or his common sense. These qualities are quickly sensed in reading the Introduction where the author points out that the place of Rome in Dante's work can only be understood in the light of his vision of history, before proceeding to outline that vision most carefully and convincingly. Then follows the first section of the book proper, 'Dante and the Roman Past', in which the conventional sources for Dante's vision, Augustine, Orosius, Virgil, etc., are each reviewed with engaging freshness. But the most original pages of this section are those in which the author considers Dante's medieval sources, such as Benzo d'Alessandria and Remigio de' Girolami. It is good to know that Professor Davis plans to develop these interesting and important ideas in a later publication. 'Dante and the Empire' (Section II) is particularly notable for its detailed treatment of Henry VII's descent into Italy, of the controversial literature occasioned by it, and of how Dante's own conception of Empire fits into this background. The position of the *populus Romanus* in the Empire here receives much-needed clarification, whilst its relationship to the *populus Christianus* leads on to the final Section, III, 'Dante and the Papal City'. Here interest centres upon the *Commedia*, and upon Dante's debt to various thinkers of the Franciscan school (Olivi and Ubertino especially) who were under the influence of Joachim of Flora, and Professor Davis' balanced judgement stands him in good stead: whilst fully acknowledging Dante's debt to the Franciscans he firmly insists that 'it is misleading to call Dante a Joachite'.

This rewarding study is completed by two Notes and two Appendices, on points of detail, and a very full bibliography.

University College of North Staffs

DONALD NICHOLL

CALENDAR OF INQUISITIONS MISCELLANEOUS, iv (1377-1388). London:

H.M. Stationery Office. 1957. viii + 394 pp. 75s.

The attraction of the miscellaneous inquisitions is precisely that the reader never knows what he will light on next. Many of the documents calendared here, of course, are routine enough: returns of felons' lands, unlicensed alienations in mortmain and the like. On the other hand, the volume begins with surveys of the landed and moveable property of Alice Perrers, the former extending into some sixteen counties and the latter including a life of St. Margaret amongst her few books. There are also surveys of the property of John of Northampton which incidentally show him dealing in wool; of Michael de la Pole and others who forfeited in 1388 which leave an impression that Sir Simon Burley was the best manager of his property amongst them all; and of a number of rebels in 1381, underlining once again the fact that some of them were men of 'considerable estate'. No less interesting, however, are entries illustrating matters less central to contemporary politics: urban decay at Lyme Regis and Appleby (nos. 44, 107, 125), the symptoms of agrarian recession (nos. 2-7, 367), Yarmouth's struggle for its herring fair (nos. 84, 183), the Black Prince's treatment of his villeins (no. 190), a conspiratorial gild at Coventry (no. 305). Fraudulent enfeoffment to avoid wardship also becomes much more understandable when viewed against the severity of the 'waste' which wardship might entail (nos. 50, 93, 123, 299, 362, 375). A record of the mode of determining lunacy is perhaps something not commonly met with (no. 227); and it is pleasant to find that an adjacent slaughterhouse was regarded as detrimental to the amenities of Balliol Col-

lege, preventing the master and scholars from attending to their studies in health and peace (no. 270). In short, the volume illustrates a rich cross-section of English life in the reign of Richard II. It contains an excellent index and the editing conforms to the high standard of Public Record Office publications, though no. 76 seems to contain two quite distinct items and a better copy of the document calendared in no. 169 appears to have been printed in E. Powell, *The Rising in East Anglia in 1381*, pp. 143-5.

*St. John's College, Cambridge*

EDWARD MILLER

MAGISTRI JOHANNIS HUS, TRACTATUS DE ECCLESIA. Edited by S. Harrison Thomson. University of Colorado Press. Cambridge: Heffer. 1956. xxvi + 251 pp.

No edition of this work in Latin seems to have been printed since the reprint of the Nürnberg edition (1558) at Frankfurt in 1715. (A Czech translation was printed in 1904 in Prague; an English translation in 1915 in New York.) The present edition is based upon no less than seventeen manuscripts, and also uses the two main printed editions. From the point of view of textual purity, it might have been better to have had one basic manuscript with variant readings instead of a conflated text, but the result is a good, coherent and intelligible text, with a comprehensive apparatus criticus.

In an admirable introduction the editor gives the history of the text of the *De Ecclesia*, in manuscript, printed edition and translation; an account of the immediate historical background which produced the work and the acute controversy in Prague that followed its production, leading to the long, complicated *processus* against Hus which culminated in his conviction and burning for heresy by the fathers of the Council of Constance.

The *De Ecclesia* of Hus belongs to an interesting genre of theological writings and has its place in the development of ecclesiology. The 'most systematic and comprehensive statement of the reform party', it can be looked at in several other ways. Hus has been compared with Wyclif, but an interesting study could, and should, be made of both Hus and Wyclif in the wider context of ecclesiological studies. The earliest treatise *ex professo* on the nature of the Church as such is usually held to be the *De Regimine Christiano* of James of Viterbo, but clearly the theologians of the twelfth century and, before, Hugh of St. Victor were groping after a more formalized doctrine of the Church. (J. Beumer, 'Zur Ekklesiologie der Frühscholastik', *Scholastik*, xxvi (1951), 364-89.). It was they who influenced the later notions of the Church as 'corpus Christi mysticum' (and Hus certainly uses this idea), as the 'universitas fidelium' and as 'universitas justorum'. Clearly in the twelfth century some theologians were worried about the presence of sinners in the Church, but had not reached the stage of Wyclif and Hus who both regarded the Church as consisting solely of the predestined ('universitas predestinatorum'). It would be a useful and important study to trace thoroughly the genesis of their ideas.

*Rhodes University*

J. CROMPTON

MARSILIUS OF PADUA: VOL. II THE DEFENSOR PACIS. Translated with an Introduction by Alan Gewirth. New York: Columbia University Press. 1957. xci + 450 pp. 68s.

This translation of the *Defensor Pacis* will be generally welcomed: in many

respects this translation of one of the most important political tracts of the later Middle Ages is an achievement of the highest order, for not only is this the first modern translation within the English-speaking world, but also one that has successfully coped with most of the numerous difficulties of the work itself baffling as they are. The reason why there have been hitherto only a few fragments available in translation, such as those by Emerton, is clearly because it is so difficult to fit the Paduan into the general framework of medieval political doctrine: neither his language nor his exposition can be easily fitted into the usual pattern of medieval political lore. In the first volume (1951) Professor Gewirth has shown himself an authoritative interpreter of Marsilius, and whatever reservations one may have had about some of his views in this volume, there can be nothing but high praise for his translation which reads very well indeed, avoids the stiltedness and stiffness of the original, brings it to life and is altogether a very faithful mirror of the tract: very rarely has the reader the impression that he is confronted with a translation, and in some places one might even find that the original has been clarified.

This is not to say that everybody will unreservedly agree with every word of the translation—how could it be otherwise with so difficult a writer who, moreover, never intended the publication of his work? Sometimes the translation may perhaps be a little too liberal, but these are points which could be made about any medieval polemical tract rendered into a modern idiom. One might, for instance, object on p. 157 (II. viii. 2) to the translation of *mentis imperia seu precepta* by 'controls or commands of the mind' (why not: 'commands and precepts?'); to the reading on p. 290 (II. xxi. 5) which should clearly be '*Constitutio Honorii imperatoris*' and therefore be translated: 'The constitution of Honorius the emperor sent to Pope Boniface' (and not: 'Letter of Constantine Honorius . . .' which is nonsensical); to the rendering of *collegium clericorum* by 'clerical group' (surely Marsilius has in mind a corporate chapter of clerics, not merely a group); to translating *pars sanior* by 'sounder part' (why not 'weightier part', i.e. identity with *pars valentior*?); on p. 282 (II. xx. 6) read Liberius (not: Tiberius). Of perhaps greater import is Mr. Gewirth's translation of the *rex Romanorum assumptus* by 'elected king of the Romans'; this, I am afraid, certainly does not correspond to Marsilius's meaning, for he would thereby have adopted the papal point of view, the one he so fiercely attacks. In contrast to the papacy which at that time regarded the emperor-to-be as a mere 'electus in regem Romanorum'—a development of the Innocentian '*rex in imperatorem Romanorum electus*'—so that the papal claim to confirmation could be said to be pushed further back to the royal election, Marsilius, by denoting the king as *rex assumptus*, tries to excise papal control over the royal election, because the elected candidate has already assumed kingship [cf. p. 296 (II. xxi. 13); p. 350 (xxvi. 11); p. 423 (xxx. 7)]. On the other hand, the translation on p. 112 (II. iii. 14) of this term by 'elected king of the Romans' is correct, because Marsilius here quotes a statement of John XXII which has, not *assumptus*, but *electus*. Nor would I agree that the *apex imperatorie dignitatis* is 'imperial throne': paradoxically enough, the medieval emperors had no imperial throne, but only a royal one, and nowhere does Marsilius speak of a throne. These are a few items which attracted my attention whilst perusing the translation.



One or two other features of the book call for comment. The Apparatus which Mr. Gewirth supplies does not always seem to me satisfactory, especially in *Dictio II*, the more topical and historical part. He has here greatly relied on that provided by Richard Scholz in his edition of the *Defensor*, and only very rarely has he amplified it; in *Dictio I*, the shorter and more philosophic section, the Apparatus appears on the other hand much better worked and more fully explanatory than in *Dictio II*. In this latter, which is after all the bulk of the work (pp. 98-424), historical references and indications to modern literature seem to me at times rather perfunctory.<sup>1</sup> For instance, on p. 87 (I. xviii. 2 init.) he should have referred to the gloss of Johannes Monachus from which Marsilius obviously took the expression *regula et mensura*, though of course applying it, not to the pope, but to the lay ruler; on p. 123, n. 46 C. N. S. Woolf might have been quoted as a help to the reader for explaining the intricate notion of *merum imperium*;<sup>2</sup> on p. 144 (II. vi. 7) it is not Peter Lombard, but Richard of St. Victor who used the expression cited;<sup>3</sup> on p. 319, n. 15 the reference is to *Clem.* II. ix. 1, and not to *Pastoralis cura*, because the former deals with the nature of the imperial oath; in the many places in which Marsilius speaks of papal approbation and imperial coronation some modern literature might have been very helpful;<sup>4</sup> on p. 348, n. 6 reference is made in support of the text to the papal decree of 11 July 1324 which cannot be right, since the book was already finished on 24 June 1324; equally, it seems quite inaccurate to say (p. 211, n. 64) that John XXII condemned on 10 November 1324 Marsilius's view on apostolic poverty, because the tract was assuredly not known at Avignon as early as that;<sup>5</sup> for the figure of Melchisedek (pp. 392 ff.) and for the frequent attacks on the papal vicariate of Christ and the resultant plenitude of power [e.g., p. 94 (I. xix. 9); p. 286 (II. xx. 14); p. 343 (II. xxv. 18), etc., cf. also p. lxxxviii] the reader might have been helped with recent literature;<sup>6</sup> he might also have been told (pp. 261-2) that the tract *De vera ac falsa penitentia* is not St. Augustine's work, but an eleventh-century product; nor are the *Quaestiones veteris et novi Testamenti* his work (pp. 246, 395), but come from the pen of the so-called Ambrosiaster;<sup>7</sup> for Leo I reference should have been made to the Ballerini edition, not to Pseudo-Isidore;<sup>8</sup> papal documents have a *comminatio*, not a *minatio* (p. 363). I am a little puzzled by the statement that Silvester II was charged with necromancy (p. 295, n. 22) and that the

<sup>1</sup> For the abundant Italian literature on Marsilius down to 1952 see F. Battaglia, *Lineamenti di storia delle dottrine politiche*, 2nd ed. (Milan, 1952), pp. 103 ff.

<sup>2</sup> C. N. S. Woolf, *Bartolus of Sassoferrato* (Cambridge, 1913), esp. the synoptic table on p. 407.

<sup>3</sup> See *PL.* cxvii. 1165 D, cap. 8.

<sup>4</sup> For instance, G. Frotscher, *Die Anschauungen von Papst Johann XXII über Kirche und Staat* (Jena, 1933); above all, E. Eichmann, *Die Kaiserkrönung im Abendlande* (Würzburg, 1943), esp. i. 265 ff.; H. Mitteis, *Die deutsche Königswahl*, 2nd ed. (Brno, 1944), pp. 213 ff. dealing with the controversies at the time of Louis IV.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. J. Haller, *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart, 1944), p. 358; cf. also *idem* in *Sav. Z., Kan. Abt.*, xxiii (1934), p. 411.

<sup>6</sup> M. Maccarrone, *Vicarius Christi: storia del titolo papale* (Rome, 1952), esp. pp. 185 ff. dealing with Marsilius. For Melchisedek cf. G. Wuttke, *Melchisedek, der Priesterkönig von Salem* (Giessen, 1927), and G. Bardy in *Revue Biblique*, xxxv (1926), pp. 496 ff., *id. ibid.*, xxxvi (1927), pp. 25 ff.; additional literature in F. Merzbacher in *Sav. Z., Kan. Abt.*, xlii (1956), p. 61, n. 23a.

<sup>7</sup> Ed. by A. Souter in *CSEL.* vol. I (1908); on the author and his work cf. G. Bardy in *Rev. Biblique*, xli (1932), pp. 343 ff., and G. Martini, *Ambrosiaster* (Rome, 1944).

<sup>8</sup> For the important point on p. 317 (at note 9) the informative paper by J. Rivière might have been cited: *Rev. des sciences religieuses*, v (1925), pp. 210-31.

papacy claimed sole power to authorize Universities (p. 297, n. 29); for the interesting personal statement of Marsilius (p. 270 (II. xviii. 6)) Mr. Gewirth could have quoted the more recent (and better) explanation by Haller.<sup>9</sup>

The other point calling for comment is the Introduction. As far as it goes it is competent and helpful; I have found the section on 'Language and Translation' (pp. lxvi-xci) particularly interesting; this is an excellent piece of work and allows those who are less familiar with the disheartening difficulties of the *Defensor*, an insight into the excruciatingly severe terminological problems set by this work. It is therefore all the more regrettable that there is nothing on Marsilius's sources and the use (and misuse) he made of his authors. Of him it was said that he was 'homo aristotelicus potius quam christianus' and therefore a section on his Aristotelianism would have been very welcome. Mr. Gewirth himself felt that some comment was called for, but I fear that the 1½ pages (pp. 433-4) are not quite adequate in view of the recent and trenchant argumentation on this very point.<sup>10</sup> There is nobody nowadays who could have given us a more authoritative survey of the authors and sources Marsilius used than Mr. Gewirth: apart from his Aristotelianism there is of course the still unsettled question of his juristic sources and the theological works which he used (or misused). Moreover, although Mr. Gewirth rightly notes in his Apparatus that Marsilius misused Cicero, Chrysostom, Jerome, etc., it would have been very helpful if he had also noted the often quite outrageous misinterpretation of Bernard by Marsilius. I wonder if in rendering the biblical quotations Mr. Gewirth might not have sometimes found better readings in the translation by the late Ronald Knox than in the Douai and authorized versions.

Lastly, the Index does little justice to the labours spent on the translation; it does not facilitate the use of the work; in very many cases I have found references missing; individual entries should have been more carefully divided. But all my observations are in no wise meant to detract from the very real achievement of Mr. Gewirth. The translation can certainly be recommended: there should no longer be any excuse for universities and schools treating this major product of medieval political doctrine in a superficial manner. Whatever view one may take of his Aristotelianism, there can be no doubt that it was Aristotle and, only to a lesser degree, the eclectic *Doctor angelicus* who enabled the Paduan to launch his frontal attack on the papal-hierocratic system: power no longer came, metaphorically speaking, from above, but from below, from the *universitas civium* that alone embodied the sum total of sovereign power, and no longer from the *universitas christianorum* which evaporated into the thin air of a mere mystical body.

Trinity College, Cambridge

WALTER ULLMANN

ADAM OF DRYBURGH (London: S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society, 1958. 185 pp. 30s.) expands the Rev. J. Bulloch's earlier studies of a prominent and interesting Anglo-Scottish figure in the religious life of the late twelfth century. Dr. Bulloch has been able to draw on ample sources for his readable and scholarly portrait of Adam as canon and abbot of Dryburgh, as preacher, and as a convert to the Carthusian way of life, while three

<sup>9</sup> See J. Haller, *op. cit.*, pp. 344 f.

<sup>10</sup> Mario Grignaschi, 'Le rôle de l'aristotelisme dans le *Defensor Pacis* de Marsile de Padoue' in *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, xxxv (1955), pp. 301-40.

chapters devoted to the Premonstratensians draw largely on Adam of Dryburgh's own writings.

It must be nearly as laborious to calendar fines as it is necessary to have it done and the editor of *FEET OF FINES FOR THE COUNTY OF YORK FROM 1272 TO 1300* (Edited by F. H. Slingsby. The Yorkshire Archæological Society Record Series Vol. CXXI for the year 1955. 1956. xii + 206 pp.) deserves gratitude for this volume. The calendaring seems to be well done (though too concise for no. I, p. 87: after 'John's right' read 'He grants to Margaret to hold . . .'). The index, which includes subjects, is adequate, with some imperfections, particularly in the treatment of judges and in spelling. Under 'Mortmain' add p. 146. It would have been helpful if the editor had stated whether he had consulted the P.R.O. class 'Notes of Fines', such as they are.

*DIE ALTESTE LEBENSDESCHEIBUNG DES HEILIGEN ADALBERT* is *Schrift 1* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht. 1957. 92 pp. DM. 8.80) and *UNTERSUCHUNGEN ÜBER INHALT UND DATIERUNG DER BRIEFE GERBERTS VON AURILLAC, PAPST SYLVESTERS II* is *Schrift 2* (206 pp. DM. 19.80) of *Schriftenreihe der Historischen Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Both constitute part of preparatory work undertaken for the *Regesta* and *Jahrbücher* of Otto III, and the studies of Gerbert's letters in particular will be indispensable for students of tenth-century Europe.

A warm welcome can be extended to *SELECTED HISTORICAL ESSAYS OF F. W. MAITLAND*, chosen and introduced by H. M. Cam (Cambridge University Press. 1957. xxix + 278 pp. 27s. 6d.). Thirteen essays, ranging from the Anglican Settlement to the first chapter of 'Township and Borough', the article from the *Encyclopædia Britannica* on the history of English Law, and obituaries of William Stubbs and Mary Bateson, display the wide range of Maitland's learning and sympathy; and Professor Cam's perceptive introduction will incite many to read Maitland's larger works again.

## EARLY MODERN

Reflection upon the changing meaning of simple historical terms is incumbent upon all who would understand the past as it really was. Professor D. Hay found the word Europe used with growing frequency in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; he set out to find why this was and what its implications were, embodying his conclusions in *EUROPE; THE EMERGENCE OF AN IDEA* (Edinburgh University Press. 1957. 132 pp. 12s. 6d.). It led him back to the Bible and the division of the world between the sons of Noah, to the classical story of the rape of Europa, to chronicles and to the early map makers. The resulting essay, short and attractive, shows first the identification of Europe with Christendom and then its definition in ever more accurate geographical form. There are a few points about which debate would be possible, e.g. the extent to which the Great Schism was involved with national animosities, but this only renders the contribution to historical thought the more stimulating. It is to be hoped that some of the issues involved can be followed up in more detailed studies.

*University of Sheffield*

G. R. POTTER



DEAN COLET AND HIS THEOLOGY. By E. W. Hunt. London: S.P.C.K. 1956. viii + 142 pp. 30s.

This volume is not a biography of Colet but rather an attempt to describe his mind and character by an examination of his extant writings and correspondence. As far as Colet's correspondence is concerned, it is regrettable that the author did not know the important letter written by Colet from Rome in 1493 and published in the *American Historical Review* and his very significant letters to Marsilio Ficino, printed by R. Marcel a few years ago. All the same, as a study of Colet's thought Mr. Hunt's book is certainly not without interest and fills what had been hitherto a sad gap in the historical literature dealing with the eve of the Reformation.

Of particular interest in this book is the chapter on Colet as a reformer. In this field his attitude was not much different from that of more than one fifteenth-century upholder of the Conciliar Movement. His originality here was perhaps not as great as Mr. Hunt suggests. This does not, all the same, diminish Colet's significance in the reforming thought of his time, which was certainly quite considerable.

*University College, London*

R. WEISS

CARLOS QUINTO, 1500-1558, SEU IMPÉRIO UNIVERSAL, by Cecília Maria Westphalen (Curitiba, Brazil: University of Paraná. 1955. 308 pp.), is a work of synthesis and interpretation based on extensive secondary material but with some surprising gaps in the bibliography. The author has overcome the difficulties of method involved in attempting to do justice to the universal aims and particular problems of Charles V by adopting a reasonable compromise between a topical and a chronological approach. But her success is partly due to the fact that the book operates only at the level of political narrative. There is an absence of economic and financial matters and no reference to the works of Hamilton and Carande. Religious problems are not explained in any depth and no account is taken of the work of Bataillon on the influence of Erasmus in Charles's Spanish kingdoms. The theme of the book is Charles's unsuccessful attempt to build a universal Christian empire in a world of nationalism and religious conflict. This is not a new thesis, nor is it an entirely convincing one. Even if we allow what may have been a purely dynastic policy with specific objectives to go by the more impressive names of 'universal' and 'imperial', the argument fails to explain why other equally Christian princes, including popes, failed to appreciate Charles's ambitions. And in view of her thesis it is surprising that the author has not made use of Chudoba's *Spain and the Empire*. In spite of these defects, Professor Westphalen has written a competent narrative account of her subject which will be useful to Portuguese readers.

*University of Liverpool*

JOHN LYNCH

ELIZABETHANS AT HOME, by Lu Emily Pearson (Stanford University Press: O.U.P. 1957. 630 pp. 70s.), is a wide-ranging but uneven work. In part—particularly on marriage—it is very much of an anthology of contemporary literary sources. In other places it pays more regard to actual practice and gets nearer the mark. With a tightening up of its style and presentation it would have become not only more brief and useful but financially accessible to students of the period. It must, however, be pointed out that many of the

transcripts are inaccurate and that the footnote system—or rather, lack of system—leaves everything to be desired. For example, the quotation on p. 130 from Lucy Hutchinson's *Memoirs* has no references at all and six errors in the text; the quotation on pp. 460–1 from Edwards' *Raleigh* has nine errors. The misquotation on p. 86 (from Ellis's *Original Letters*) fills one with alarm.

University College, London

J. HURSTFIELD

Professor Charles H. McIlwain and Paul L. Ward earn our warm thanks for bringing out a modern edition of William Lambarde's *ARCHEION OR, A DISCOURSE UPON THE HIGH COURTS OF JUSTICE IN ENGLAND* (Harvard University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 1957. 176 pp. 40s.). This Elizabethan study of our legal and political institutions is important as representing the best historical learning of the time and because it was written and revised in the later years of the reign, when such prerogative institutions as the Star Chamber and the Court of Requests were coming under attack. The tract was first published, in two editions, in 1635 and the editors now reprint the second 'newly corrected and enlarged according to the author's copy', though with annotations giving variations of text in the first edition and in some of the manuscript copies of the tract. In a scholarly appendix, Professor Ward discusses these variations and has some interesting and useful remarks to make about the composition of the work, as well as its publication. The only regret a reviewer can register concerns the price of this edition, which evidently envisages and will ensure a severely restricted sale.

University College London

J. E. NEALE

In 1685 Henry Wharton (b. 1664), who had recently graduated, was awaiting at Caius College, Cambridge, an opening for his scholarly talents. Amongst the other literary exercises with which he amused himself was a Latin essay on Captain John Smith, author of the *True Travels* (1629), and celebrated for his part in the founding of Virginia, 1607–9. Dr. Laura P. Striker has now published an unannotated translation of this essay (from the text in Lambeth MS. 592), together with an introductory paper of her own on 'Captain John Smith in seventeenth-century literature', under the title *THE LIFE OF JOHN SMITH, ENGLISH SOLDIER* (University of North Carolina Press. London: O.U.P. 1957. 101 pp. 32s.). The appearance of this work is scarcely justified in its present form. A Latin text, with a translation, might have been a useful gesture of historiographical piety. Without the text it is difficult to know quite what to make of the translation in detail. In the introduction Dr. Striker claims that Wharton clarifies in some respects Smith's rambling account of his Hungarian adventures in his youth, but if this is so her arguments for his use of a lost source are unconvincing. Smith was so incoherent on this subject that an adaptor could scarcely but improve him. What Dr. Striker does not indicate is that Wharton made nonsense out of Smith's perfectly clear account of his Virginian activities. Anyone who uses Wharton as a historical source does so at his peril, the interest of the essay being wholly in what he chose, rightly or wrongly, to select for biographical treatment, and the language (not yet in print) in which he did it.

University of Liverpool

D. B. QUINN

ARBELLA STUART. ROYAL LADY OF HARDWICK AND COUSIN TO KING JAMES. By P. M. Handover. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1957. 336 pp. 30s.

Arbella Stuart, that charming and learned though rather unbalanced lady whose life was turned to tragedy by her proximity to the throne, has attracted no less than six biographers. Miss Handover has therefore had the advantage of dealing with an historical figure whose correspondence has already been edited and whose life has been investigated in detail. She has not added greatly to our information. What new light she throws upon Arbella's story is largely drawn from the printed collections of sources, such as the Calendars of Scottish and Venetian State Papers, which have been published during the last half-century. She has been industrious in collecting material and has attempted to place Arbella in her proper setting, for she believes that this has never been done before. And yet the result of her work is disappointing. This is due in part to the peculiar difficulties of her task. There were sudden and dramatic events in Arbella's life, and her last years form a sad and moving story, but for long stretches of time she lived quietly in the country and there is little for the biographer to relate. Yet at the same time, because of her claim to the throne, she was the unwitting pawn in plots and intrigues and the object of close attention by a great variety of people. 'The Lady Arbella Stuart', as Miss Handover says, 'is a figure on a tapestry rather than a portrait, for she cannot hang alone.' But when the author begins to trace the numerous and diverse influences and personalities which played upon Arbella's life, she is drawn in many directions. Thus the book opens with a chapter on Bess of Hardwick, a chapter on the story of Lady Catherine Grey and Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford, a chapter on the marriage of Arbella's parents. Arbella's birth and childhood are described in Chapter IV, but the reader is then led away in Chapter V to a discussion of Mary Queen of Scots. Investigations of plots and intrigues carry the author into complicated and nebulous details which are frequently far removed from the central figure. In short, the book is diffuse and lacks the coherence supplied by constant attention to a single personality.

Miss Handover makes a very large number of errors. Some are mere errors of fact: Esmé Stuart was not the nephew of Lord Darnley, and Sir Francis Stewart was not the brother of the Duke of Lennox. Other errors are of a nature to indicate that Miss Handover is not at home in the period with which she deals. Thus, when James I asked Parliament for a grant of money in 1610, the Speaker of the Commons is made to retort that kings must not demand contributions at their pleasure. This makes strange reading, for Sir Edward Phelips, the Speaker in 1610, was a devoted servant of the Crown. Miss Handover's interpretation of Sir Robert Cecil is quite unacceptable. He is portrayed as a dark and terrible figure, who steadily eliminated his rivals by the most sinister means and who exercised a mysterious and evil influence over Arbella's fortunes. 'There was something in him of the woman, the serpent and the tiger.' Some sentences have little meaning. King James, says Miss Handover, 'expected self-interest in those nearest him, and with the exception of Esmé and Ludovic Stuart, he had always found it'. If one is seeking an example of selfless devotion, Esmé Stuart is an unfortunate choice. Miss Handover does not always handle her sources with skill and judgement. In discussing the marriage of King James and



Anne of Denmark, she employs a quotation from Bishop Goodman who is describing the royal pair many years later in England when King and Queen had drifted apart and did not live together. But James at the time of his marriage was deeply in love with his bride. None the less, Miss Handover has written an interesting and lively book which will be read more widely than most works of riper scholarship.

*University of Minnesota*

D. H. WILLSON

THE RISE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY PARTY IN THE ENGLISH HOUSE OF COMMONS, 1603-29. By Williams M. Mitchell. Columbia University Press; London: O.U.P. 1957. xvi + 209 pp. 32s.

Perhaps reviewers, like politicians, enjoy denouncing in others the sins they have committed themselves. But this book is a sad warning to all who approach parliamentary history with a card-puncher and an adding machine. It provides, briefly and comprehensively, a lot of information about M.P.s which workers on narrower topics will gratefully borrow; but it has no serious arguments or conclusions that are not better stated elsewhere. Professor Mitchell has not derived much help from the efforts of earlier authors and editors. Despite the dates in the title, a fifth of the book deals with Elizabethan parliaments: Sir John Neale is not mentioned. Among the twelve secondary sources listed for the whole book are Burnet's *History of the Reformation* and a *Complete History of England* by White Kennett (1706). The raw material comes in bulk from the Commons Journals, supplemented by D'Ewes, the Calendar of State Papers, and a selection of the parliamentary diarists. Analysis of obviously massive lists reveals that the ratio of frequent speakers to infrequent speakers was 1.3 : 1 in 1571, but only 0.7 : 1 in 1601, that in 1626 the ratio of committees for legislation to days of sitting was 1.02; that in 1621 of 135 recipients of office or benefit from the government 21 were 'important people'—and a great deal more.

To be fair, Professor Mitchell insists that 'a large admixture of common sense is necessary in dealing with statistics'. He quotes a letter from Bacon naming opposition members of the first Stuart parliament, whom he believed—wrongly, in nearly every case—to have been won over, as 'worth a barrel of statistical evidence'. But there is not much of its kind; and dippings into the barrels offered do not altogether inspire confidence. The list of the Addled Parliament and the court connections of its members shows up badly in comparison with Mr. Moir's recent book, as indeed does all the chapter on 1614. Too often when the counting has been done the author remains devoted to statements which, as he puts it, 'can be neither doubted nor proved'. His ideas of doubt and proof may be questioned.

The term 'revolutionary' in the title is never properly considered: usually one kind of opposition is assumed to be as good as another. The theme is the 'party', and the snag is that almost any list of political allies can be called a 'party' or not according to taste. Professor Mitchell concludes that until 1626 'there was strong opposition but not a real party' but that in the parliament of 1628 'the party, or at least its nucleus, had come into being'. He names 60 opposition members of the 1628 parliament, 31 of whom sat in the Long Parliament. Eight of the 31 are chosen for a select list in the text, and 16 'were to stick through and sign the Covenant in 1643. Here indeed was a solid nucleus'. But what of the other half who did not 'stick

through'? A little more counting would have shown that 10 of the 31, including two of the favoured eight, became Royalists. Of course more of the Civil War Parliamentarians sat in 1628 than in earlier parliaments: more were old enough to do so. And of course some of the opposition leaders had long experience of that rôle. It did not need all this hard work to tell us that.

*University of Manchester*

D. H. PENNINGTON

IN THE ADDLED PARLIAMENT OF 1614 (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1958. x + 212 pp. 30s.), Mr. Thomas L. Moir provides the first critical account since Gardiner of that brief interlude in the 'personal government' (1610-21) of James I. Mr. Moir demolishes Gardiner's rather glib generalizations about the composition of the Commons and shows that the elections cannot be regarded as a defeat for the crown. In fact, rather more officials and courtiers than in 1604 found their way to Westminster. The quality of government support was poor, it is true, but it was matched by the inadequacy of the apparent leaders among the critics—Sir Edwin Sandys could not check hot-heads out for the blood of imaginary 'undertakers'. In short, Gardiner's assertion that up to 'the unfortunate episode' of the dispute with Bishop Neile 'the proceedings of the Commons were all that could be desired' is patent nonsense, unless it be taken to mean desired by men like the Howards, no friends to parliaments. On most points Mr. Moir supersedes Gardiner, but his own work has its flaws, notably on the deeper issues. He is, moreover, a desultory, repetitive writer—do we need to be reminded three times in a dozen pages that Sir Robert Carr became Viscount Rochester? And why is the useful content of the appendices not indexed? Still, this book is certainly 'good in parts', and adds to our knowledge of a reign that more and more demands attention if we are to understand the forces that produced the crisis of the sixteen-forties.

*University College, Cardiff*

IVAN ROOTS

The object of Irvonwy Morgan's *PRINCE CHARLES'S PURITAN CHAPLAIN* (London: Allen and Unwin. 1957. 220 pp. 21s.) is to show the part played by John Preston, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn and Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in the rebuilding of an effective puritan party, in the country, at court and in parliament, in the 1620s. Much attention is given to the Duke of Buckingham's 'godly fit' and its relation to his Spanish adventure (a 'fit' during which Preston is said to have been in the duke's bedchamber thrice a week) and to the alignment of anti-Spanish and pro-French elements with the Scots about the court and with the puritans. Mr. Morgan has discovered few new facts about Preston's life, and although he examines Preston's association with students at Cambridge who were later to be active on the puritan side in parliament, as well as with Prynne and other pamphleteers, the evidence hardly supports his concept of 'a Preston grouping'. There is a good deal of narrative of familiar history in which Preston is lost sight of, the argument is often laborious and sometimes repetitive, and most readers will be repelled by the use of 'wasn't', 'didn't' and 'doesn't'. That there has been something of a gap in puritan history in the early seventeenth century is undoubted, but this book is only a minor contribution towards filling it.

*University of Edinburgh*

GORDON DONALDSON

FATHER LUKE WADDING—COMMEMORATIVE VOLUME. Edited by the Franciscan Fathers, Dun Mhuire. Dublin: Clonmore and Reynolds. 1957. 652 pp. 63s.

Fr. Luke Wadding (1588–1657), in honour of whose tercentenary this volume of essays is published, is the best known of the many Irish ecclesiastics who had distinguished careers on the continent in the seventeenth century. The important rôle which he played in the history of the Irish Church and nation during the central years of this century explains why he should be so remembered and honoured in Ireland. It would be wrong, however, to limit his importance to the realms of politico-religious Irish history. Few men can have had such a varied career or combined such conflicting interests. He studied and taught in the Iberian Peninsula, helped to found the Irish College in Rome, played a large part in Irish affairs, and was a noted theologian, Scotist, and Franciscan historian. Though his historical work is not discussed in this book, the Franciscan editors are to be congratulated on a volume which should be of interest and value not merely to students of Irish history, but to all who are interested in ecclesiastical history and the history of scholarship.

*St. Mary's College, Twickenham*

P. J. DUNNING, C.M.

HENRY MORSE, PRIEST OF THE PLAGUE. By Philip Caraman. London: Longmans. 1957. xi + 201 pp. 18s.

Henry Morse was a brave, idealistic young man who ministered, with utter devotion, to the spiritual and material needs of plague-ridden London in 1635–6 but who suffered, because he was a priest, the barbaric execution of a traitor. In turning from the translation of two Jesuit autobiographies to writing the biography of a third, Father Caraman has fully maintained the high literary standards of his earlier works. It is a moving and tragic narrative, which loses nothing in the telling.

Works of this kind are especially welcome for the insight they give into the martyrdom of these courageous young men. On the scaffold Morse thanked God for the call 'to seal my faith with my blood, a favour I have begged these thirty years'. The Protestant minister present, bewildered by this strange yearning for martyrdom, coldly observed: 'You have now got your wish'. Morse belonged to that inspired group, ready to give all on the assumption, and in the hope, that they would end by earning a martyr's death. When Morse's friend, Father Robinson, was told that he was not to suffer the same fate, he expressed his disappointment in a letter to the General of the Jesuits: 'I had hoped to be hanged, but in vain'.

An understanding of this frame of mind involves the use of other disciplines apart from that of the historian. But even in the historical field Father Caraman has perhaps missed an opportunity. For the book never gets beyond hagiography, vivid and readable though it always is. Hearsay and slander are cheerfully mixed with more trustworthy sources. Good stories—relevant or irrelevant—are brought in wherever possible: the man-eating dragon; the execution of a felon half a century after Morse's death; the atrocities of the Dutch Protestants, witnessed, not by Morse, but by somebody else; and so on. The result is that the historical perspective of religious persecution is wholly sacrificed in favour of a one-sided picture of seventeenth-century England. It is time to consider whether this kind of historiography



may not in the end alienate the sympathies it is apparently designed to arouse.

*University College, London*

J. HURSTFIELD

PURITANISM IN THE PERIOD OF THE GREAT PERSECUTION, 1660-1688.

By G. R. Cragg. Cambridge University Press. 1957. 326 pp. 30s.

Dr. Cragg has here given us a companion to his previous book: *From Puritanism to the Age of Reason* (1950). In that work he examined some of the intellectual origins of toleration in England in the late seventeenth century; in this he examines the effects on the puritans of the preceding period of persecution. The first two chapters are a summary of the persecution itself—of its establishment in 1660-70, and of its motives and methods. In the remaining seven chapters he addresses himself to his main theme. What spiritual and intellectual resources did the puritans use to protect themselves? How was their devotional and communal life affected? How did they manage to deal with the temptations and dilemmas of their situation? How did they fare in the pamphlet controversies with the establishment? Dr. Cragg's answers are based on a close reading of the published works of the puritan divines and of the published records of their churches. His sympathies are plain for all to see, but do not impair the balance of his treatment, and his comments are often shrewd and telling. He makes it clear that the persecution was, all allowances made, a heavy one. It brought sufferings of almost every sort, small and great—worry, frustration, impoverishment, illness and death. Yet during most of this period many puritans prayed together (between 8 and 9 every Tuesday morning) for their persecutors. Dr. Cragg's book is in effect an explanation of how they found the strength of mind and grace of spirit to do that; of how they transmuted persecution itself into spiritual gain. It is a profoundly moving and humbling story and will attract many readers. (Not only the specialist in this period, one hopes, for much of it is relevant to a consideration of any period.) Dr. Cragg might well have taken more care over some details—it is odd to find a book by an authority on this subject giving 'nearly 2000' as the number of the ministers ejected in 1662 (a figure disproved twenty years ago by Dr. A. G. Matthews); and odd to find Cornelius Burges's name misspelt and to read that Bunyan could see the 'Berkshire hills' from his prison. The account of the two conventicle acts is a misleading summary of the differences between them; and (to descend to mere slips) there are some careless mistakes in the bibliography. More generally, one notices certain gaps in Dr. Cragg's knowledge of the politics of the period, and one could argue that he has included some material (in the chapters on devotional life and worship) which is not distinctive of this generation of puritanism. He has in addition neglected the evidence of quarter-sessions records and of laymen's diaries (e.g. Roger Lowe's). For all that he has written a well-organized and readable book, and one which was badly needed.

*Royal Holloway College, London*

R. C. LATHAM

THE EARLY CHURCHILLS. AN ENGLISH FAMILY. By A. L. Rowse. London: Macmillan. 1956. xi + 420 pp. 36s.

In this volume Dr. Rowse gives an account, not only of the first Sir Winston and his offspring, but also of John Churchill's wife, the notorious Sarah.

About Sir Winston he has collected more information than has hitherto been assembled and put it to fairly good use. If Sir Winston was not a great man, his career is of interest as showing what could happen to a certain type of servant of the King. He did not make a fortune; on the other hand, his sons John and George got a good start in life; so too did his daughter Arabella, if to become the mistress of the heir presumptive be accounted a piece of good fortune. Sir Winston himself, however, remains a dim figure. Nor do we yet know much about his children, with the partial exception of John. Dr. Rowse has written sketches of the lives of George, the Admiral, and Charles, the General, that are all the more welcome because neither has yet had the attention he deserves. But lack of documents has largely frustrated Dr. Rowse's valiant attempt. It could be argued that he has given too much credit to George and it is certainly a pity that he has not been able to find out more about the relations of George with John.

To add materially to what is known of John himself, though not impossible, would require extensive labour in England and abroad. Dr. Rowse has very naturally considered that for his purpose he could rely on what was in print, but it is to be regretted that he has not made himself familiar with the correspondence of Marlborough and Heinsius published in 1951. That correspondence does illuminate Marlborough's enigmatic character, to the interpretation of which Dr. Rowse gives much care. His view may be described as intelligently favourable. A less favourable view, especially of Marlborough's career before the death of William, would be equally defensible. Space does not here permit a discussion of debatable points. But two things must be said in conclusion. Firstly, Dr. Rowse writes with that vigour and clarity to which his readers are accustomed; secondly, this volume shows signs of inadequate revision; it contains, indeed, a surprising number of slips, some of which, no doubt, are trivial, but by no means all.

*University College, London*

MARK A. THOMSON

IN THE LIFE OF CHARLES 2ND EARL OF MIDDLETON, 1650-1719 (London: Staples Press. 1957. 255 pp. 21s.) Mrs. Dorothy Middleton has given us a pleasantly composed and readable account of a minor figure. Middleton was an attractive man—witty, able, honest, capable of winning the admiration of many who disagreed with him—but, as his biographer here admits, he never achieved anything of real importance. His embassy to Vienna in 1680-1 was his first political post, and in describing this phase Mrs. Middleton has used to good effect his letters to Secretary Jenkins, among the Middleton papers in the British Museum. (Her method of referring to them is, however, extraordinarily inefficient.) This section of the book is an addition to our knowledge. For the rest, the story remains much as we knew it. Middleton was secretary of state for Scotland in 1682-4, and for England in 1684-8, but he was never in Charles's or James's full confidence, and in tapping his papers Mrs. Middleton seems to have been able to draw off only the unstimulating small beer of minor administrative detail. After a period of retirement (including a short spell in prison) in 1689-93, he escaped to St Germain, and there, as secretary of state to James in exile, he led the cause of the moderates or 'Compounders', who were willing to make terms with parliament and protestantism, believing that Jacobitism could never be a

serious political force if it ceased to concentrate on England and English conditions. This was before Middleton became himself a Roman Catholic in 1702, and when he still represented what little sanity there was in his cause. After 1702 he became much like the rest of the exiles—living in a world of shadows and illusions, divided from England by more than physical distance, driven to depend on a Scottish rebellion and on French help, both of which Middleton more than most people knew to be deceitful hopes. Having lost influence at court in 1713, he took no part in the '15, and died soon after.

*Royal Holloway College, London*

R. G. LATHAM

THE ACCESSION, CORONATION AND MARRIAGE OF MARY TUDOR, as related in four manuscripts in the Escorial, edited and translated by C. V. Malfatti (Barcelona. Oxford: Blackwell. 1956. xix + 165 pp. 42s.), consists of four contemporary accounts of the early part of Mary's reign, until her marriage to Philip II. The first two, by the Italian Commendone, have very little fresh material to offer. The last two, letters from the Spaniard, De Barahona, are brief, vivid accounts, with some unintentionally humorous comments on the hardships of living in England. It is a pity that the translations are neither happy nor lucid, but the appendix gives these documents in their original Italian, Latin and Spanish, and reprints also a Spanish leaflet about the coronation ceremony.

EXETER IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY: TAX AND RATE ASSESSMENTS, 1602-99, edited by W. G. Hoskins (Exeter: Devon and Cornwall Rec. Soc. n.s. II. 1957. xx + 154 pp. Map. 30s.), is a valuable addition to our knowledge of the topography and inhabitants of an important provincial town. It is preceded by an excellent introduction by Dr. Hoskins.

PROGRESS NOTES OF WARDEN WOODWARD FOR THE WILTSHIRE ESTATES OF NEW COLLEGE, OXFORD, 1659-1675 (Devizes: Wilts. Arch. and Nat. Hist. Soc., vol. XIII. 1957. xx + 114 pp. 30s.), edited by R. L. Rickard, consists of the memorandum-books kept by a particularly conscientious administrator concerning the college lands at Alton Barnes, Colerne and Stert, to which the editor has appended terriers, extracts from court rolls, a rental and a rent audit account. The collection will be serviceable, and we should express our gratitude to Mr. Rickard and the Society for it, but it is necessary to add that the editing suffers from a failure to explain some points of primary importance (e.g. whether the notebooks are part of a series), as well as from a concern with what should be obvious (e.g. the distinction between vicars and rectors). Several misprints, mistakes of fact, and inaccuracies in the index remain uncorrected.

THE MORAL REVOLUTION OF 1688 by Dudley W. Bahlman (Yale University Press. O.U.P. 1957. x + 112 pp. 24s.), the second of the Wallace Notestein Essays, is an interesting and well-written account of the societies for the reformation of manners. Mr. Bahlman has made good use of the archives of S.P.C.K. (with some other manuscript sources), and of the literature of various sorts put out by the promoters and the antagonists of the movement for moral reformation.



THE CAROLINE TRADITION OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR, by F. R. Bolton (London: S.P.C.K. 1958. xvi + 338 pp. 45s.), discusses the doctrines and liturgical usages of the Church of Ireland, which through being confronted by the double challenge of Presbyterian and Roman Catholic was early compelled to define the nature of its authority. It was in consequence less affected by nineteenth-century change than the Church of England, and so a study such as this contributes to our understanding of English as well as of Irish ecclesiastical history.

## LATER MODERN

THE NEW CAMBRIDGE MODERN HISTORY. Volume VII: THE OLD REGIME, 1713-63. Edited by J. O. Lindsay. Cambridge University Press. 1957. 625 pp. 37s. 6d.

Almost half a century lies between the completion of the old *Cambridge Modern History* series and the publication of the first volumes of the *New*. In mood the series are far apart, and no reader will lightly charge Sir George Clark and his fellow editors with harbouring the faith of Lord Acton and his associates that the final, triumphant stage of historical knowledge is at hand. As for differences between this particular volume and the corresponding sixth volume of the older set, they are not less striking.

The latter examined the entire eighteenth century, at least up to the French Revolution; the present volume, entitled *The Old Regime*, deals only with the fifty years between the peace settlements of Utrecht and the close of the Seven Years War. This periodization seems valid; at least it is congenial to our present thinking. So much so indeed as to suggest that the traditional denomination itself is obsolete: 'Old Regime' carries no connotation of the exciting novelty and changes, in some instances truly revolutionary, which marked the fifty years concerned.

In the older volume, too, apart from an unsatisfactory effort in the Preface to link the particular states of Europe into a larger unity, they were taken up *seriatim*, almost as self-contained entities. Here, factors and forces more or less common to Europe as a whole come first. Eight chapters, exclusive of the editor's Introduction, deal with developments or trends or values which transcend changes within each particular country. Comprising almost one-third of the entire volume, they examine successively international trade, social structures and politics, the visual arts and imaginative literature, religion, the administrative systems, the intellectual movement, the armed forces, and international relations. Then follow eight more chapters, in their total length slightly greater, which take up the internal history of individual European countries or areas, from England and France in the West to Poland and Russia in the East. In the last third of the book we have one group of chapters on mid-century war and diplomacy and a final grouping on the extra-European world, the Americas, India, Africa and the Far East.

The early chapters are in many ways the most interesting. Making use of concrete and specific illustration, and in that way escaping the danger of presenting a spectral dance of bloodless categories, they point to the existence of something which sociologically-minded historians would call a pattern or *Gestalt*. That pattern in its fullness and variety is of course only unevenly

exemplified in some countries, as is later brought out. Yet the treatment suggests (rather than states explicitly) that something distinctively European did exist, a style of life and behaviour characterized by great human vitality, restlessness and critical enquiry, expansion of material resources, competition for power and wealth abroad, and a determined quest for security and stability within.

The treatment of these themes varies from chapter to chapter. Of the one on visual arts and imaginative literature, it may be said that it attempts too much within a brief compass and ends by giving too little. In a contrary sense, the pages on religion and international relations tend to overtax the reader with details, some of which are repeated, almost inevitably, later. More effective is the procedure in the chapter on the revolutionary increase in international trade and the ensuing and related changes in governmental policy and state rivalries. Adequate and forceful accounts also throw light upon the complexity of the social structures and the pronounced trends toward greater administrative efficiency and control. Useful and valuable too is the late Eric Robson's clear account of the armed forces and the art of war. Alfred Cobban handles the *Enlightenment* coolly and discriminatingly, and with a touch of disillusionment or vexation over its *naïveté*. He, like Robson, shows some inclination to make more of defects and shortcomings than of positive achievements. He writes of his own picture of the *Enlightenment* that it is 'somehow not impressive', and the reviewer while agreeing with that verdict does not agree that the story of the astounding impact of that movement upon the world and its practical strength should be deferred for later treatment.

The chapters on the particular countries have the merit, all of them, of relating contents to the larger ensemble of developments. For their learning and lucidity there can be only praise. Particularly noteworthy for the skill with which political, economic and social processes and changes are blended together are the pages dealing with France, England, Poland and the Habsburg dominions. If Frederick II and Maria Theresa do not emerge notably different fifty years after, they at least hold their own as great architects of state unification, while Orléans, Fleury, Walpole, Peter of Russia and even the long-attacked Louis XV rise in stature from the revisionist judgement.

With respect to the three chapters on the War of the Austrian Succession, the Diplomatic Revolution, and the Seven Years War, no one would wish to deny that they are excellent of their kind, particularly for the convincing reassessment of the rôles of Kaunitz and Frederick II. Whether such extended attention to details is justified according to the general plan of the work and especially since it starves other topics and areas is a question on which all readers will not agree. For example, surely something more could have been given, somewhere in the volume, on the place that scientific method and cumulative scientific data, most of all in the natural sciences and in Europe as a whole, held in the thinking and aspirations of the cultivated. Granted, moreover, that the idea of progress belongs to a later volume, more room conceivably might have been found for its antecedents. Why music is entirely neglected is not clear, nor the skimpy handling of the French peasantry, medical, police and social welfare policy in the Germanies. Mr. Thistlethwaite does wonders in the thirteen pages at his disposal for internal developments in the thirteen colonies, but his excellent pages could not in the circumstances

be other than summary. While war and diplomacy, as indicated, are not slurred, there is a curious omission of anti-militarist speculation and the several characteristic projects of federal organization to replace balance of power reality.

Without question this volume will take its place in succession to the older work as an exceedingly valuable work of reference. And like its predecessor it has the defects inherent in all collaborative works where a score of contributors are called upon. The large themes of the growth of a dynamic, security-conscious state system, of expansive, power-minded élites, are there. Europe is presented in depth and breadth, and an attentive reader will not remain oblivious of all that. But he will have to concentrate hard on the pages to get that sense of the whole, and the Introduction by Mrs. Lindsay regretably affords him little help, for it is in the main little more than a digest of what comes later. Obviously the characteristic American phenomenon of 'packaging' intellectual goods can be carried too far; yet something might have been gained by grouping relevant chapters together under 'Parts' or 'Books'. Solid pages, on several occasions three or more, might have been broken down into paragraphs. Most of all one regrets the editorial decision not to have a bibliography accompany each volume. The reviewer cannot but feel that its omission seriously impairs the effectiveness of a text which has so much to commend it for its broad outlook and its incorporation of the best of recent scholarship.

*New York University*

LEO GERSHOY

A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING PEOPLES: III. THE AGE OF REVOLUTION. By Winston S. Churchill. London: Cassell. 1957. 332 pp. 30s.

What made the first volume of Sir Winston's history so exciting was to watch an imaginative and historical mind recreating the long past. What made the second volume such a deeply moving revelation was to journey through two hundred years with a great statesman and a great writer who was reliving the past for us. What gives to this third volume a distinction all its own is the complete mastery with which the author controls and manipulates the extremely complicated narrative. Much of the excitement of the first volume is missing, almost all the emotion of the second, yet volume three sustains with ease and assurance the lofty standards of the other two. The style is, if it be possible, more severely simple, the sentences curter, the full stops more numerous; but all this disciplined refinement only enhances the wonderful lucidity which lights the narrative from start to finish. Nor are the flashes of colour and of humour missing. Read the account of the South Sea Bubble:

'An orgy of selling began, and by October the South Sea stock stood at 150. Thousands were ruined. The porters and ladies' maids who had bought carriages and fineries found themselves reduced to their former station. Clergy, bishops, poets, and gentry found their life savings vanished overnight. There were suicides daily. The gullible mob whose innate greed had lain behind this mass hysteria and mania for wealth called for vengeance. The Postmaster-General took poison. His son, a Secretary of State, was snatched from his accusers by opportune smallpox. Stanhope, the chief Minister, died of strain. . . . The books of the company were mutilated and incomplete. Nevertheless it was discovered that 462 members of the Commons



and 122 peers were involved. Groups of frantic bankrupts thronged the Parliamentary lobbies. The Riot Act was read. There was a general outcry against the cupidity of the German ladies. "We are ruined by Trulls—nay, what is more, by old, ugly Trulls, such as could not find entertainment in the most hospitable hundreds of Old Drury." "

The pages abound with apt and unforgettable phrases: 'the flimsy, untested fabric of American unity': 'Walpole and Newcastle had been much more than Ministers; they were almost Regents': 'A high-poised if not sagacious or successful opposition'.

Once again we are given a gallery of portraits, sketched with an economy of line which only heightens their effectiveness. For example, take that of Burke, 'a voice crying in the wilderness and too often rising to tones of frenzy. An orator to be named with the ancients, an incomparable political reasoner, he lacked both judgement and self-control. He was perhaps the greatest man that Ireland has produced. The same gifts, with a dash of English indolence and irony—he could have borrowed them from Charles James Fox, Henry Fox's famous son, who had plenty of both to spare—might have made him Britain's greatest statesman.'

There are, of course, criticisms to be made. The experts who have advised Sir Winston have not always kept him up to date—his account of the Saratoga campaign is based on an authority which is dated in a footnote 1911, and reveals no acquaintance with the work of Van Tyne, which was published in 1939. J. H. Plumb's first volume of his life of Walpole was published too late for Sir Winston to have used. It is curious that once again (as in the Tudor volume) no attention is given to literature, and the Industrial Revolution receives but a very fleeting reference.

More generally, the volume is open to the criticism that it deals too restrictedly and too subjectively with war and politics, with war as an extension of politics. All the greatest narrative historians are subjective, and Sir Winston is no more subjective in the political and military realm than (say) was Froude in the religious. It is this subjectivity which makes them so readable. This volume must be judged within the limits which the author has set for himself. He is first and foremost a political and military historian, and in this volume he deals with a period which was predominantly political and military. The scales are weighted on the military side, with the result that the balance of the book is disturbed. But with what insight does the author grasp the military genius of Chatham! The Peninsular campaign has never been more brilliantly, more economically, more intelligibly analysed for the general reader. No doubt the general balance will be redressed in volume four, when Sir Winston comes to deal with the great period of parliamentary government in the nineteenth century. We await that volume impatiently.

G. R. N. ROUTH

ISLAMIC SOCIETY AND THE WEST: A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION ON MOSLEM CULTURE IN THE NEAR EAST. Vol. I, Pt. II. By H. A. R. Gibb and H. Bowen. Oxford University Press. 1957. vi + 285 pp. 35s.

Part I of this volume (published in 1950) is devoted to a survey of the political, administrative and economic institutions of the Ottoman empire,

as they existed in the eighteenth century. Part II completes this survey by describing firstly taxation and finance and thereafter the religious, legal and educational institutions, the dervish orders, and the non-Muslim communities of the empire; it also contains a list of the chief sources used in the writing of the entire volume. Part II (like Part I) is based to a large degree on secondary works, both old and new. The authors themselves note that future research in the rich documentary material preserved in the Ottoman archives will lead to modifications, in numerous points of detail and even in principle, of the conclusions set forth in their work. None the less, considered as a whole, this first volume—the result of a long and assiduous labour—embodies within itself a rich store of information and ideas about the institutions and social structure of the Ottoman empire on the eve of those profound changes that were soon to be introduced under the impact of influences from the West.

*School of Oriental and African Studies, London*

V. J. PARRY

LEIBNIZ UND DIE ENGLISCHE SUKZESSION DES HAUSES HANNOVER. By W. Fricke. (Quellen und Darstellungen zur Geschichte Niedersachsens 56.) Hildesheim: August Lax. 1957. ix + 141 pp.

There is still something to be said about the attitudes of the electress Sophia and of her son, George Louis, to their prospects of ascending the throne of England. English historians have hardly given the matter the attention it deserves; they have not even made full use of Klopp's edition of the correspondence of Sophia and Leibniz. Ward, who could and should have gone a good way towards telling us what we want to know, is meagre precisely where he ought to have been copious; Klopp has a good deal to say in his monumental *Der Fall des Hauses Stuart*, but his judgement was far from impeccable, his use of the Hanoverian archives was restricted by circumstances over which he had no control, and his understanding of English affairs was remarkably limited. For a full study by one who is equally competent to explain what happened in England and what happened in Hanover, we still have to wait. But Dr. Fricke's study has definite merit. Leibniz concerned himself much with the succession and was trusted, though not blindly, by Sophia. The printed sources and documents in the Hanoverian archives enable the authoress to follow Leibniz's activities pretty closely and they are worth following. Not that Leibniz had much political sense; while his zeal was almost excessive, his judgement was at best but mediocre, and at worst deplorable. The truth is that he knew very little about England, for all his pains to inform himself. Dr. Fricke's book makes us realize how hard it was for Sophia and her son to do the right thing. The difference in their characters is shown by the fact that while Sophia sometimes erred by doing too much, George's policy seems to have been to do as little as possible. About George, however, Dr. Fricke says comparatively little. It was not, indeed, her concern to do so, since George was not influenced by Leibniz. But it is a pity that she did not have a clearer conception of English politics; lacking that she sometimes failed to see the significance of the documents she used. Nevertheless her book can be read with pleasure and profit, and her readers will regret that an untimely death has put an end to her historical studies.

*University College, London*

MARK A. THOMSON

The Post Office has received more attention from historians than any other modern department of state, but if Dr. Kenneth Ellis's study of *THE POST OFFICE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY* (Oxford University Press. 1958. xvi + 176 pp. 25s.) does not substantially change the accepted picture, it casts a good deal of light into some of the darker corners. Every student of the eighteenth century knows that the business of the Post Office was as much to open letters as to deliver them; now we see the mechanism at work, even to the three hours it took to tamper artistically with the King of Prussia's despatches. Similarly the labours of the Post Office in distributing ministerial propaganda have long been familiar; now we have a connected treatment of the subject over a long period, though material for the strenuous age of Walpole is still slight. Most interesting of all, the main core of the book, an account of the career of Anthony Todd, is a piece of administrative history of the best kind, revealing the lively influence of politics within and without the office upon departmental development, and showing how considerable were the financial stakes in the contest of Palmer and his coaches against Todd and his carts. It is a pity that Dr. Ellis did not carry this type of treatment back to the beginning of the eighteenth century, for in the early Hanoverian period purges among the local postmasters were so notorious, pilfering from the post so acknowledged a scandal, and the distrust between the two factions which united in the ministry of 1721 so bitter that each felt it necessary to appoint one Joint Postmaster-General—all manoeuvres so public as to cast doubt on Dr. Ellis's thesis that a really high standard of security was maintained in the intelligence branches. There is nevertheless much food for thought here, not least on the way in which, as studies of eighteenth-century administration accumulate, a common pattern in the development of the great offices is beginning to emerge.

*University of Manchester*

W. R. WARD

Mr. K. A. MacMahon's edition of the *BEVERLEY CORPORATION MINUTE BOOKS (1707-1835)* (Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series, vol. cxxii for 1956. xxvi + 116 pp.) will prove useful to national as well as to local historians. It will help to provide material for answering a rather neglected question of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century history—what was happening in the old traditional towns in the period of the rapid rise of the great new industrial centres. Though not swept up by an industrial revolution they were not unchanging. Thus in the early eighteenth century Beverley still had, as the Minute Books show, a 'Medieval-Tudor' character: local government was still in the hands of local tradespeople. But after mid-century the town developed into a middle-class residential centre, and gentlemen, attornies and bankers began to wield control. In their hands local government became more exclusive, or (as Radical critics after 1815 would have termed it) more 'corrupt'. Thus the cost of purchasing freemen's rights, which conferred the valuable right to trade within the borough, was progressively raised till by 1825 it had reached a minimum of seventy guineas plus duty and fees. By 1835 it was not only in a parliamentary sense that Beverley had become a 'rotten' borough.

For reasons of space Mr. MacMahon has not calendared all the material in the Minute Books. Instead he has extracted 'for summary notice those minutes which could be considered to have some significance and illustrative



value'. This subjective approach is not ideal but Mr. MacMahon seems to have selected his material carefully. And in these days of high costs the choice was selection or nothing.

*University of Leeds*

DONALD READ

GEORGE III AND THE HISTORIANS. By Herbert Butterfield. London: Collins. 1957. 304 pp. 21s.

Professor Butterfield's broadside against the 'Namier school' gives in its first half (after some wise counsels on historical writing in general) an interesting survey of opinion about George III, from his accession until this century. Contemporary political journalism, as well as the first historians of the reign, chief among them the admirable Adolphus, are drawn upon to show that the King's defenders (the 'Tory interpretation'), no less than his critics, credited him with a 'new system'. In the whole sequence the extremest 'Whig' versions, Erskine, May, Lecky, and G. O. Trevelyan, had but a short time—except amongst College entrance candidates—and were soon corrected (in a 'Tory' direction), by Ruville, Vaucher, Winstanley, and Temperley, who in differing measures anticipated Sir Lewis Namier. 'Namier', says Professor Butterfield, 'does not quite take the system of Adolphus and Winstanley as his point of departure'; in fact he surely took the Newcastle papers. Professor Butterfield is anxious to establish that those who talked of George III as introducing a 'new system' were right. Issues of constitutional principle were in 1760, he maintains, brought to the fore in a 'new way'. One cannot but wonder if the controversy here does not turn on the use of words, as much as on the evaluation of different sorts of evidence. So much depended on the personal equations of King, ministers, and other politicians, that it is difficult to express the *nuances* exactly, even the *Structure of Politics* being only a snapshot, though a big one. Phrases about a 'new system' surely need not imply constitutional counter-revolution, but like Aristotle's *stasis* could apply to displacements of persons, and would certainly cover what John Adolphus called George III's 'moderate exercise of his constitutional prerogative'. Had not George II in 1727, by a similar exercise of his constitutional prerogative, intended a 'new system', with Spencer Compton as his Bute? The reversionary interest apart, and the peace also—did not the 'newness' of the way in which, in 1760 and the years following, the constitutional issue (not itself new) came to the fore, reflect the facts that George III and Bute were *as persons* unlike George II and Spencer Compton; and that Bute successfully ousted Pitt and Newcastle, whereas Walpole very quickly came back? Professor Butterfield, incensed by Mr. John Brooke's denigration of Burke and the Rockinghams, makes at first sight a telling point against him for not stressing the declared intention of George III and Pitt in 1766 to form a ministry on strictly personal and not connectional grounds, but he hardly allows for Mr. Brooke's contention that the main reason for the disintegration of the tessellated pavement was Chatham's foolish ignoring of connection. More important perhaps is Professor Butterfield's criticism of the 'Namier school' on grounds of method and direction. He is anxious to assert that beliefs, opinions, and principles are things of real historical potency and importance, and he is justified by the dangers which attend on too exclusive a concern for 'structural analysis', necessary though that analysis may be. 'Presbyterian literalists and counters

of heads', as he calls them (but why 'Presbyterian'?), may leave no room for greatness; they, as much as any Marxist, may crudely reduce matters of conscience to the merest *epiphenomena*. The 'Namier school' has, it is true, concentrated on electoral processes, court intrigues, and (to a less extent) on administration—on the inside workings rather than the external professions—but this is because the inside workings are what the great masses of political correspondence are about. Even so, as doubtless they would agree, 'interest' is not all, though it may be more nearly all than men of great conscience may willingly recognize. Burke himself, after his experience of Bristol, complained 'how much a constitution *in fact* differs from a constitution *on paper*'.

*Bedford College, London*

R. W. GREAVES

COUNTRY BANKING IN THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION. By L. S. Pressnell.

Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1956. xiv + 591 pp. 70s.

The list of archives scoured by Dr. Pressnell testifies to the scope of his research: he has undertaken the first comprehensive investigation of country banking upon a national scale. The result is a volume which will remain quite indispensable to economic historians, upon which one may confidently presume that secondary scholarship will depend for the next generation as the main quarry for data on the development of country banking. In this sense Dr. Pressnell's work measures in stature and function with that of Wadsworth and Mann on the early cotton industry and of Professor Ashton on iron and steel.

From the middle decade of the eighteenth century country banking emerged rapidly as a specialized function from the womb of whichever business activities were dominant in a locality: virtually every major industry and trade—and some professional men such as the country solicitors—spawned bankers to provide the financial services necessary for their life and, more particularly, their growth. Thus merchants in foreign trade like the Heywoods and the Leylands tended to be the most important source for banking in Liverpool and the other main ports; copper and tin magnates like the Praeds were to the fore in Cornwall; ironmasters like the Lloyds and the Wilkinsons in the Midlands; the much publicized cattle drovers in mid-Wales; brewers like Lacon, Cobbold, Clinch in small country towns and ports in the south and east of England. If drapers proved to be such fruitful recruits to banking, that reflected the dominance of the cloth trade. Already, established entrepreneurs had accumulated the requisite wealth upon which they might begin trading in money. Some of their banks developed as a source of activity and profit largely independent of the businesses from which they sprang, prospering upon the various needs of their districts for financial services (for example, the Gurney banks of the Norwich area grew out from a trade in yarn servicing the local textile industry but expanded in the early nineteenth century mainly upon the agricultural wealth of the region). Others, particularly the industrial and trading banks, often flourished in direct support of the other businesses controlled by their partners. Industrial bankers supplied local currency for wages and accepted deposits which helped their short-term financing and in some cases became absorbed more permanently in the buildings, mines, machines and land of their other ventures. Turnpikes and canal companies usually had bankers as their treasurers

—originally the banker acted as agent for deposits of the capital and subsequent revenues, perhaps seeing his position primarily as the means of enjoying a useful float of capital, but when funds ran short he not infrequently became the source of borrowing to complete the undertaking. In agriculture, too, during the boom years of investment during the Napoleonic Wars many country bankers, in particular the less secure of them, became heavily committed to advances to farmers and landowners. Such exceptions to the avowedly 'normal' policy of English bankers lending only short were exposed when times of depression and panic in the money markets took their toll of the country banks. When an industrial bank was shaky its fortunes had usually been pledged to the business. With the impossibility of obtaining any overall statistical picture of banking business in the eighteenth century (long runs of accounts even in individual banks are scanty) it becomes a little difficult to see exactly how much the accumulated instances of long-term lending cited here should change the traditional picture of the part banking played in British industrial expansion. The greatest men of the trade, such bankers as the Gurneys and Samuel Jones Loyd, continued to know a bill from a mortgage and were careful not to keep any significant proportion of their commitments in loans which could not be realized fairly quickly. Apart from industrial ventures of their own (to which the mining bankers were particularly engaged) most bankers lent short most of the time. However, even loans pegged to a few months, or a float of discounts, if allowed to run on continuously by renewals could play the part of longer-term lending by allowing the entrepreneur to engage more capital of his own in more permanent ways, while the banker kept the right to pull back his money without much delay when he needed it.

Perhaps the most important aspect of Dr. Pressnell's work has been to show how intimately the country bankers became linked with London. Some country bankers, indeed, owed their origin to accumulated tax-receipts delayed to form the basis for the new enterprise on their way to the authorities in the capital. The 'bill on London' financed a large share of the nation's economic activity; from the beginning of the nineteenth century, led by Thomas Richardson and Samuel Gurney, the London bill-brokers provided exactly that channel between the local banks in various parts of the country through which credit could flow from regions with surplus funds (predominantly the agricultural areas) to those with expanding needs for discount facilities. Thus, even the Corn Laws were reluctantly harnessed to the chariot of industrial expansion. Structurally, too, the banking system was linked to the metropolis through many country bankers being partners in the London banks which acted as their agents, as well as by the agency system itself. The pressure to reduce a London overdraft or to build up one's balance with the London agent often acted as a more immediate control over country issues and lending than did the actions of the Bank of England. Moreover, local bankers provided the channels whereby government stock and other securities were marketed in the provinces, and whereby funds were transferred to London for spending. All these functions of the country banks in helping to create the conditions which made the Industrial Revolution possible Dr. Pressnell describes at length, with further important chapters on the rôle of the banks in economic fluctuations and commercial crises. So great an accumulation of detail inevitably makes the book a little unwieldy for the



non-specialist reader. From the nature of the records in the banks, too, one may suspect that sometimes the evidence conceals the full degree to which a banker's business was related to his other activities, overestimating the 'autonomy' of the bank. It is made explicit here that the Cornish mining banks were always servicing the mines. The Southwark hop merchant bankers relied heavily on their customers for banking custom; the Lacon banking ventures remained very closely associated with the family's other activities in brewing, malting, corn-merchanting and ship-owning; Cobbs in Margate kept brewing as the linch-pin of their bank and their shipping interests. As the business records of the bankers' customers continue to yield their harvest it is to be expected that some change of emphasis may come here: this volume itself contains the harvest of the country banks.

*Queens' College, Cambridge*

PETER MATHIAS

THE HIGHLAND ECONOMY 1750-1850. By Malcolm Gray. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 1956. 280 pp. 25s.

British economic history in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has sometimes been written in terms of a new economic system, of high productivity, which rapidly knocked out and replaced all other systems and in doing so rebuilt from the ground up British society and our social and economic policies. The reality of course was different. The new industry and the new agriculture which supported it were only half the picture. Past the Irish Channel and the Minch and in West Wales, another and older world continued to exist far down into the nineteenth century, with its own conditions and problems, to which the politicians and the economic philosophies of the time had often painfully little to say. The new world was of industries and towns and world-wide economic connections; the old, of primitive rural economy, too many people living on too little land, and agrarian distress. The one developed towards the Great Exhibition of 1851; the other towards the Irish famine and the Highland dearth of the 'forties.

It has been difficult until recently to lay hands on good studies of the agrarian side of modern British history. Now, with Mr. Gray's study of the Highlands, Professor Williams' book on the Rebecca riots and the diligent enquiries of Irish scholars into the Famine, the case is altered and a more complete view becomes possible.

Mr. Gray, perhaps it should be said, says little of these wider issues. His is a straightforward, scholarly and useful account of the economic development of a particular region, the Scottish Highlands, in the hundred years after the Forty-five. With wide knowledge, based on the estate papers as well as the extensive printed sources, and with a marked economy of rhetoric in surveying former battle-fields, he traces the main movements of Highland economic life. He first describes the structure of Highland economy in the mid-eighteenth century, before the remarkable changes which swept over Scotland within the lifetime of Adam Smith. His account brings out the strangeness of that vanished society, with its immense social gulf between the aristocratic families at the top, with their varied and expensive demands, and the peasant, with his monotonous diet, ineffective labour and dependence on imported meal and corn at the bottom. Then come the efforts of the Highland gentlemen to make more of their estates, with the aid of a powerful industrial and money economy in the Lowlands and in England, willing to

buy wool; the decline of the old fashioned farming, and the rise of new occupations, such as kelp-gathering. In those years between the American War and the end of the French wars, the expansion of the Highland economy seemed to show signs of keeping pace with what one might call 'the Malthusian factor', the growth of population. But the rate of expansion was not maintained, while the population continued to increase and to do so under cramped and potentially dangerous conditions. What had at one time looked like becoming a story of economic success ended deplorably and inconclusively. To judge by recent English regional studies of the eighteenth century, it would probably require an even more detailed and localized account to bring out thoroughly the complex interplay of demographic and other factors at work. But those who do not read economic history solely for its success stories, but in order to understand the puzzling processes of economic change, will find the book well worth reading.

*University of Birmingham*

W. H. B. COURT

COAL AND STEEL IN WESTERN EUROPE. By N. J. G. Pounds and W. N. Parker. London: Faber, 1957. 381 pp. 42s.

This book is an ambitious attempt to write an economic history of the coal, iron and steel industries of the major producing regions of Western Europe (Germany, France, Belgium, Lorraine, Luxembourg and the Saar) from the eighteenth century to the present day. Britain and Sweden are excluded. The authors have spent eight years collecting material and their skilful use of the relevant articles in French and German periodicals is particularly impressive and valuable. In the earlier chapters Professor Pounds, a geographer with a bias towards economic history, tends to give the impression that some of the smaller producing areas were economically as important as those with much larger outputs. Professor Parker, an economist with a bent for economic history, had the more difficult task of tracing a pattern of development in the mass of facts available for the period of rapid expansion from the 1880s onwards, when both the history and the identity of individual enterprises are in danger of being swamped by impersonal statistics and collective agreements. In spite of a tendency to lapse into economists' jargon Professor Parker has been to a large extent successful. This well-produced book will prove a most useful and, apart from some minor errors, a most reliable guide for students of the modern economic history of Western Europe.

*University of Manchester*

W. H. CHALONER

THE CRAWSHAY DYNASTY: A STUDY IN INDUSTRIAL ORGANISATION AND DEVELOPMENT, 1765-1867. By John P. Addis. Cardiff: University of Wales Press. 1957. 184 pp. 12s. 6d.

Richard Crawshay of Cyfartha, who died in 1810, was in his own lifetime one of the greatest ironmasters, if not the greatest, in the world. The high position of the Crawshay works could not last, of course. But the firm, managed by the main line of the family, remained prominent in South Wales until late Victorian times. Crawshay Brothers and Company changed over from iron to steel production early in the 1880s and soon after was transformed into a limited company. This last move was the result of financial strain. It did not save the firm, which was taken over in 1902

by Guest, Keen and Company, incorporating the Crawshays' old rival, the Dowlais ironworks. Cyfartha went into production for the last time in the First World War—a fitting end, for the first great days of the works dated back to the Napoleonic wars and the vast fortune which Richard Crawshaw gathered out of war contracts. Cyfartha Castle, the product of the social ambition of the second William Crawshaw, now belongs to the corporation of Merthyr Tydfil.

Business history is an important part of national history. It is important, then, that it should be written in conformity with the best standards of historical scholarship. Mr. Addis has studied the primary sources, in particular the collection of Cyfartha papers now in the National Library of Wales. He analyses conscientiously some of the main problems which faced the partners at different times—marketing and price policy, for example—as well as describing at length what is his chief interest, the character and relations of the partners. He writes clearly and does not bore us with unnecessary details. But it must be confessed that the character of the Crawshaw partners, a set of strong-willed, conventional, quarrelsome men, does not provide first-rate biographical matter. Meanwhile, some other questions go unanswered. What qualities made the Crawshays great men of business? It is not possible to make such things clear without spending much time on business policy and persuading the reader to follow suit. Probably it was a mistake to relegate the valuable material on finance and capital-formation to an appendix. Labour supply and the handling of industrial relations get scarcely any attention. And in a general way the book would have benefited by a more firmly drawn background and by relating the history of the Crawshaw firm to the economic development of South Wales in general and the iron industry in particular. Business histories are often overlong, but in this case a longer and more circumstantial treatment would, one feels, have been justified.

*University of Birmingham*

W. H. B. COURT

EUROPE SINCE NAPOLEON. By David Thomson. London: Longmans. 1957. 909 pp. 42s.

THE SHAPING OF THE MODERN WORLD, 1879-1939. Vol. I, ENDS AND BEGINNINGS—THE WORLD TO 1914. By Maurice Bruce (with chapters by K. H. Francis and W. Carr). London: Hutchinson. 1958. 970 pp. 42s.

DIE MODERNE WELT, 1789-1945. Vol. I, DIE EPOCHE DER BÜRGERLICHEN NATIONALSTAATEN; Vol. II, WELTMÄCHTE UND WELTKRIEGE. By Hans Herzfeld. Brunswick: Georg Westermann. 1957. Vol. I, DM. 11.80; Vol. 2, DM. 17.80.

Every generation needs new general historical surveys. Dr. Thomson's admirable survey of *Europe since Napoleon* takes full account of recent research (there is an excellent bibliography of English and French works) and its approach to the recent past is one which will no doubt commend it to many readers. After 1946 the destruction caused by the war and the danger from Soviet Russia have forced the countries of Western Europe to co-operate both for mutual defence and to revive their shattered economies. The establishment of NATO, the European Payments Union and the Iron and Steel Community has been followed by an ambitious plan to establish a customs



union between six of the leading industrial states of the Continent. In the circumstances it is natural that historians should enquire whether these developments have been brought about by the circumstances of the post-war era or whether they are really due to deep underlying trends which can be traced back to 1815 or 1789. It is from this point of view that Dr. Thomson has written his account of Europe since 1815. He emphasizes those factors in Europe's development—population trends, industrialization, parliamentary democracy, socialism and many others—which have not been peculiar to one country or region but have been common to virtually the whole of Europe. Sometimes he pushes his argument too far, as when he describes institutions which were really different—e.g. parliamentary institutions in mid-Victorian England and in France under the Second Empire—and yet argues that there were fundamental similarities which few previous historians have been able to discover. His book is really a series of analytical and critical essays in which he examines 'trends' and discusses 'factors'. Many important topics, e.g. the Bagdad Railway, are discussed from one point of view alone, while a reader who wants to know something about the underlying and immediate causes of the Russian revolution of 1917 will have to look in seven different places. This is not a continuous narrative; it is a historian's history rather than a student's history. It has the merit of being extremely well written. Discriminating scholars will wish to see it on their shelves next to G. M. Trevelyan and H. A. L. Fisher.

*The Shaping of the Modern World* by Mr. Bruce and two of his colleagues at the University of Sheffield, is also an excellent general survey. It covers the period 1870–1914 and a second volume on the years 1914–39 is promised. Mr. Bruce, like Dr. Thomson, is familiar with the results of recent research and his assessment of events is balanced and impartial. The structure of the work, however, follows a more conventional pattern. It includes with the Great Powers of Europe, Britain's overseas possessions, Africa, India, the Far East and the United States. Mr. Bruce is less interested than Dr. Thomson in emphasizing general trends, but is always prepared to sacrifice details in order to explain why particular developments occurred. To a student already familiar with the outlines of world history in 1870–1914 this is an excellent commentary.

A third survey of the modern world—*Die moderne Welt* covers the years 1789–1945—is that by Hans Herzfeld and forms part of a series of volumes on modern history edited by Gerhard Ritter. Professor Herzfeld gives a detailed factual account of European and world affairs. His bibliographies are particularly valuable and contain most useful references to many recent books and articles.

*University of Manchester*

W. O. HENDERSON

THE FAILURE OF THE PRUSSIAN REFORM MOVEMENT, 1807–1819. By Walter M. Simon. Cornell University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 1955. ix + 272 pp. 32s.

This scholarly monograph brings out very clearly exactly how and why the Prussian reform movement failed and traces the fatal clash of personalities (rather than of principles) which led finally to the dismissal of Boyen, Behme and Humboldt from the Prussian cabinet and the capitulation of Hardenberg and Frederick William III to Metternich. These twelve years (1807–19)

were perhaps the most momentous in the modern history of Prussia and of Germany, surpassing in significance even those between 1859 and 1871 or between 1933 and 1945. The interference of Napoleon in Prussia's domestic affairs, resulting in the dismissal of Stein, had administered the first serious blow to the Prussian Reform Movement, but the *coup de grâce* was given by Prussian statesmen themselves. Dr. Simon agrees with the judgement of Treitschke and Meinecke that 'Hardenberg could have defended liberal institutions in Prussia only by resolute opposition to Metternich and to his influence over Frederick William III' and underlines the view that 1819 was the essential prelude to the even greater failure of 1848, as well as to the tragic history of the century that followed. A valuable critical bibliography enhances the usefulness of the book.

*University of Birmingham*

J. A. HAWGOOD

THE PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE OF ADMIRAL LORD COLLINGWOOD.

Edited by Professor Edward Hughes. London: Navy Records Society, vol. 98. 1957. xiii + 348 pp. 45s.

The biographical interest of these letters is great—greater perhaps than their strictly historical value, for the volume contains no official correspondence. Biographically, however, they throw a flood of light upon a character hitherto often misunderstood and, in the past, too often belittled. Collingwood had none of the more eye-taking qualities of his great contemporary and friend, Horatio Nelson; and, since circumstances made personal comparisons rather inevitable, he suffered unduly: unfairly too, for there was only one Nelson, and Collingwood never showed the least desire to be regarded as another. He was, in fact, much more like the modern type—an officer of the 'Silent Service'.

His letters reveal what a steadfast, simple and honest man he was, but by no means a small one either, nor one whose sole claim to fame was as moon to Nelson's sun. They show him as a great man in his own right, so indispensable to his country and his masters at the Admiralty that they could only bring themselves to dispense with him when they had as good as killed him. The letters must certainly be welcomed as an overdue refutation of the late nineteenth-century view of him epitomized in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, where Sir John Laughton dismissed him as 'mediocre'—'an admirable second-in-command, but without the genius fitting him to rise to the first rank as commander-in-chief'—a verdict which this volume reveals as entirely erroneous.

M. A. LEWIS

There seems to be only one justification for the publication of *SOLDIER'S GLORY* (London: Bell. 1956. x + 325 pp. 21s.), an abridged version of Sir George Bell's *Rough Notes of an Old Soldier* made by his kinsman Brian Stuart. The original edition, published in two volumes in 1867, is easy to come by and it is hard to agree with Sir Arthur Bryant in his introduction that Bell was a 'brilliant writer', as Grattan or the anonymous private of the Highland Light Infantry were. Bell's merit lies in his own personality—his courage, his cheerfulness, his affection for humanity—and in his length of experience, for he was young enough in the Peninsular War to see service in the Crimea as well. The abridgement is intended for popular reading only as it omits

most of the account of the period between the two great wars in which Bell fought, an account which is of considerable interest to the historian of the army. The editing is rather slapdash. There are unaccountable changes in Bell's punctuation and not a few misprints. The few notes are not very helpful; that on p. 182 about the Ionian Islands is particularly inept. And the editor has omitted the significant and bitter dedication which Bell wrote for the original edition. Much more necessary and more scholarly is Cecil Aspinall-Oglander's *FRESHLY REMEMBERED: THE STORY OF THOMAS GRAHAM, LORD LYNEDOGH* (London: Hogarth Press. 1956. x + 309 pp. 25s.). Graham was ill-served by his first biographer, Delaroye, and this new book takes the place of the one we had hoped for from the late Mrs. Maxtone Graham. Without any of the apparatus of scholarship, footnotes and bibliography, it is yet soundly based on the available material, as one who has also worked on the Lynedoch papers in the National Library of Scotland can testify. The book has architecture, perhaps even more noticeable after Delaroye's shapeless bulk, and is written with charm and judgement. Graham was an interesting and unusual figure, a Whig country squire who became a soldier only in middle age, but who succeeded so well in his adopted profession that he became Wellington's choice as second in command in the Peninsula. General Aspinall-Oglander's biography is well worthy to stand beside Mrs. Maxtone Graham's biography of Graham's beautiful wife whose death marked a turning-point in his life.

*University College, Aberystwyth*

S. H. F. JOHNSTON

RECORDS OF THE BOROUGH OF NOTTINGHAM. VOL. VIII 1800-1835; VOL. IX 1836-1900. Edited by Duncan Gray and Violet Walker. Corporation of Nottingham. 1952, 1956. 509 and 462 pp. £2 2s. each.

When the first volume of the Nottingham Borough Records appeared in 1882, the editor, W. H. Stevenson, explained that his principle of selection 'has been to excerpt not only what is of interest to the curious but whatsoever seemed to be of value for the history of the town'. To make such a selection, he found, was 'an invidious task, much being omitted that it were, perhaps, desirable to have included and *vice versa*'. These editorial doubts were confirmed in 1902 when James Granger, a life-long student of the town's history, complained that only a single entry of the Chamberlain's accounts was included for the period 1652-1702, so that he was unable to trace expenditure of which he had other evidence; and he feared there were many other important omissions besides those relating to financial matters. This is not to say that the two volumes under review are open to the same criticism; but being compiled on the same principle, they do not entirely allay the doubts of the student who asks himself, as he turns over the pages of verbatim extracts, what and how much has been left out?

In the second of the two volumes, the mass of evidence was such that the editors had to resort to the practice of recording by *précis*. By this means, they have been able to present the gist of the Council's affairs over the busiest seventy years of its history and to produce a volume that puts into shade—if not to shame—its eight predecessors. One cannot but reflect that in *précis* form, they might have been presented as a calendar of *all* instead of a verbatim reproduction of *some* of the Borough Records.

If the two volumes differ widely in form, they differ in content still more.



In the first the Corporation is seen as the landlord thinking almost exclusively of its own property. The real corporate life of the town went on outside it, in the work of the vestries, improvements commissioners and other *ad hoc* bodies. The borough had neither the means (its first rate was levied in 1794 for the upkeep of the gaol) nor the will to do more, except for sporadic and feeble support given to charitable enterprises, road improvements and the like. Indeed, far from helping to solve the fearful problems of the time, the Corporation contributed to them by setting its face against enclosure of the common lands around the town, a decision which helped to intensify the squalor in which the rapidly growing population was condemned to live. But the Corporation rang bells for famous victories and distinguished deaths, polished the civic silver, let off strange and complicated fireworks, provided refreshment to six men for keeping 'waken a poor woman that 'ad taken too much lodlum' and paid £1 to the corporation chimney sweep for the death of his ass in the pound—all recorded with verbatim thoroughness by the faithful editors of Vol. VIII.

As keepers of the peace, the Corporation came into the centre of the picture in the period of the Luddite riots, and by means which are not explained, the letters of the men's leaders prior to the actual outbreak of violence are included in the Borough Records and are here reproduced. They represent by far the most important contribution that the volume has to make and are especially valuable in the light they throw on the character and career of Governor Henson.

In 1832, the cholera outbreak gave rise to the appointment of a board of health; but it was temporary and did nothing to prevent the ghastly congestion of thousands of inhabitants of the town in courts without water, drainage or paving and walled up at both ends except for a tunnel less than four feet wide. Officially, the break with the bad old days came in 1835, but apart from the formation of a police force there seems little to show for it for ten years. Then in 1845 the enclosure was carried through in a spirit to which the editors do something less than justice in the Introduction; and in 1849, the Sanitary Committee issued their historic report in which, while acknowledging their entire dependence on Divine blessing, they proposed to proceed as though the responsibility were theirs alone.

The supersession of the Deity in the matter of sanitation by the servants of the Corporation marks the first stage in the emergence of the modern municipality. The reports of the Sanitary Committee are given in commendable if horrific detail, and in a surprisingly short time, progress was made that reflected itself in the relative immunity which the town enjoyed from the effects of the next visitation of cholera. On 23 June 1851 a rate of 2½d. was made for 'town improvements' and the transition from a manorial landlord to a municipal rating authority can be said to have been accomplished.

*University of Nottingham*

J. D. CHAMBERS

SCOTCH REVIEWERS: THE EDINBURGH REVIEW, 1802-1815. By John Clive. London: Faber. 1957. 224 pp. 25s.

In some 200 pages, Mr. John Clive has contrived to give a well-documented account of the founding and the early fortunes of that 'great moral steam-engine' which did so much to carry the fruits of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment into the intellect of nineteenth-century England. The first

number of the *Edinburgh Review* came out in October 1802. Its blue and buff covers (the colours of the Foxite Whigs) contained 252 pages, more than twice as many as its eminent predecessors, *The Monthly* and *The Critical*. There were no less than twenty-nine articles and five reviews running to more than fifteen pages each (one ran to twenty-nine). It cost five shillings. Within a year it had sold over 2000 copies, and within twelve years the circulation had increased twenty-fold. Who read it? *L'homme moyen intellectuel*, everyone with the least pretension to cultural interests, which meant most people of the upper and middle classes. 'One begins to catch the echo of its fame from country squires, rusticated peers, and provincial doctors,' wrote Horner in 1804. Its Editor, Francis Jeffrey, an Edinburgh lawyer short of business, was one of the cleverest little men alive. He had with him the solemn, but enormously able economist, Francis Horner; the struggling *parvenu* lawyer, Henry Brougham, who was ready to write authoritatively on any subject under the sun at a moment's notice; and that immortal wit in a dog-collar, Sydney Smith. This little conclave (they were all under thirty in 1802) had hardly any money but enormous gusto. Between them they turned Whiggery into liberalism, and they did it by paying high rates to their contributors and by a most astute policy of shocking and entertaining and instructing all at once. Nevertheless, as Mr. Clive shows, editorial policy was based on certain sound basic principles. Nothing was published that failed to conform in general with the ideas and ideals of the Enlightenment. By transposing this heritage into terms of Benthamite liberalism, the *Edinburgh* sharpened, if it did not transform, the mind of modern England. In these days of enfeebled rationality and reviving superstition, it is an inspiring story, and Mr. Clive has told it with authority and charm.

*Downing College, Cambridge*

R. J. WHITE

CHARLES JOSEPH LA TROBE. SUPERINTENDENT OF THE PORT PHILLIP DISTRICT, 1839-1851. LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF VICTORIA, 1851-1854. By Alan Gross. Melbourne University Press. 1956. ix + 157 pp. 18s. 6d.A.

This modest but pleasantly informative monograph was written by a member of the Victorian Historical Society, one of those Australian historical societies which kept alive an interest in Australian history when it was all but ignored by the universities. La Trobe was one of the many able and conscientious administrators who so much assisted the peaceful and profitable settlement of Australia, without pleasing either Colonial Office or colonists. Nevertheless, as Mr. Gross points out, the settlement of a quarter of a million people in the fifteen years 1839 to 1854 was 'an historic achievement, and one without parallel in the records of colonization'. Mr. Gross's biography, like other modern biographies of colonial governors, is a vindication—an almost inevitable reaction to the denigration of the colonial governors by most nineteenth-century historians of Australia. Mr. Gross recognizes the limitations of La Trobe, and the magnitude of the problems he faced, realized neither by his superiors in London, nor by the colonists, and concludes that his administration was reasonably successful. When he reached Victoria he set about his task in that 'uncouth continent' with ability and enthusiasm, and only found himself in difficulties when gold vastly magnified the problems he had to cope with. His main claims to fame are undoubtedly his

turning back from Melbourne of the *Randolph* with its convicts (but whether from principle, or fear of disorder, is not clear), and his association with the foundation of Melbourne Botanic Gardens, Museum and Public Library, and University. Mr. Gross writes well, but he has not given us a definitive biography, nor even a detailed account of La Trobe's administration. His book is, indeed, slight in content, but it is a useful beginning to a full-scale history of early Victoria.

*Nuffield College, Oxford*

R. M. HARTWELL

THE BOMBS OF ORSINI. By Michael St. John Packe. London: Secker and Warburg. 1957. ix + 313 pp. 25s.

This book is not, as its title might suggest, simply an account of Felice Orsini's attempt to blow up the Emperor Napoleon III on 14 January 1858. It is probably the first comprehensive account of Orsini's career to be published in book form in English since the appearance in 1857 of his own *Memoirs and Adventures*, translated by George Carbonel. The book is written in a popular style—for instance, we are told that 'Anything went at the Congress of Vienna'—but Mr. Packe has used the main Italian sources and authorities including the works of Luzio and Ghisalberti (except the latter's recent *Orsini Minore*) and claims that the events that he recounts 'are true in every detail'. When he has to deal so largely in secret societies and conspiracies the claim may seem rash, but he has indeed hit upon a tale well worth retelling both for its lively illustration of the futile heroism of many of Mazzini's disciples and because of its intrinsic excitement. In the first half of the book Orsini is a comparatively small figure against the European and Italian background which is sketched vividly but not wholly accurately; but in the second he comes into his own. The story of his amazing escape from Mantua and of the final Parisian tragedy could hardly fail to hold attention and Mr. Packe tells it well. In a brief appendix he discusses some of the problems relating to Orsini's arrest and trial in Paris, among them the legend of the lady dressed in black. Was there such a missing accomplice and, if so, was she really Mr. J. D. P. Hodge of Glastonbury? Mr. Packe does not enlarge upon the subject 'except to point out two strains of evidence which have so far not been explored', but he leaves the reader with a strong desire to know more about Mr. Hodge and his movements.

*Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*

J. P. T. BURY

BISMARCK, GLADSTONE AND THE CONCERT OF EUROPE. (University of London Historical Studies IV.) By W. N. Medlicott. London: Athlone Press. 1956. 353 pp. 35s.

After Professor Medlicott had in 1938 described the Congress of Berlin and its consequences up to the spring of 1880, he now continues with an account of the following two years. Gladstone's victory of April 1880 in the Midlothian campaign had given a new turn to British foreign policy. Gladstone's programme had asked for a concert of the great European powers to secure the peace of Europe and to carry out the remaining decisions of the Congress of Berlin. Outwardly this plan at first met with the approval of the Great Powers, but from the beginning it encountered Bismarck's opposition. The German Chancellor was not only annoyed that the election had frustrated the results of cabinet diplomacy, but also saw in Gladstone the representative



of the political principles of his opponents at home. Medlicott quotes some utterances by Bismarck, in particular the instructions of 26 February 1884 which had previously been kept secret. These show clearly his passionate hatred of Gladstone and his inability to grasp the essence of a parliamentary monarchy. Thus the German Chancellor maintains that every month of the Gladstone regime brings a republic nearer in Britain. He also endorses an alleged remark by Palmerston—probably whispered in his ears by Lothar Bucher—that Gladstone would die in a lunatic asylum.

In spite of Bismarck's attempt to isolate him, Gladstone at first succeeded in getting the Powers to agree on common action against Turkey. But he had to make a discovery, subsequently made also by the League of Nations and the United Nations, that normally unity only extends to negotiations and that it disappears once there is danger of a serious conflict. When the united fleet demonstration did not succeed in making the Sultan cede the frontier granted by the Congress of Berlin to Montenegro, and when England wanted to put new pressure on him by the occupation of Smyrna, the other powers refused to participate, much to Bismarck's joy. Fortunately the British threat had been sufficient to frighten the Sultan and to make him yield. It was now difficult to speak of a Concert, although it made another appearance over the settlement of the Greek question.

Bismarck was at that time not really concerned with the execution of the decisions of the Congress over which he had presided, but with the establishment of the alliance of the Emperors of Germany, Austria and Russia. He had himself made its attainment more difficult by the conclusion of the Austro-German alliance of October 1879. The impression is gained from Medlicott's careful analysis of the German, Austrian, and Russian sources—of which a considerable portion is published for the first time—that Bismarck tired of the Austrian alliance soon after its conclusion. In any case, in the negotiations between Russia and Austria which were conducted via Berlin and Friedrichsruh, he invariably took the part of Russia. For this he blamed mainly the caution of the Austrian Foreign Minister, Haymerle. The editors of the German publication *Die Grosse Politik*, who document these negotiations quite inadequately, have supported this theory by the reproduction of Bismarck's despatch to the German Ambassador in Vienna of 17 May 1881 (III, Nr. 530) which heaped words of the most severe censure on Haymerle. And yet Haymerle only made a—justified—effort to keep the 1879 treaty intact.

Professor Medlicott's book is a very important contribution to the understanding of European politics in the 1880s, noteworthy for its wealth of new material and the author's penetrating critical analysis.

ERICH EYCK

HEINRICH VON TREITSCHKE. By Andreas Dorpalen. Yale University Press.

London: O.U.P. 1957. viii + 345 pp. 48s.

The book is planned as the first full-length biography of a man, who as writer of contemporary history and as publicist was undoubtedly a very strong force in the formation of public opinion among the educated middle-class of Germany after 1871. It offers careful analyses of Treitschke's writings from all periods of his life and enables the reader to trace the development by which the liberalism of his early years faded out under the impact of his

belief in German power as an ultimate value, which did not allow any competing claim. Professor Dorpalen emphasizes that this trend, which became noticeable after Bismarck's striking success in 1866 and dominated his writing and teaching after 1871, did not represent a genuine change of mind, because Treitschke's championship of individual liberties had always been conditioned by his opposition to governments which he considered an obstacle to the growth of national unity. Another change of front is of greater importance. Treitschke's programme in the field of international relations, as he formulated it in his political essays before the establishment of the Empire, excluded all political aims outside the European continent. After 1871 he became more and more convinced that the Empire needed a definite place in a world-wide system of power equilibrium to guarantee her prestige and even her safety. That is how England on account of her naval supremacy became the arch-enemy in the publicist's political system and at the same time the symbol of utilitarian philosophy utterly antagonistic to the true German way of life.

The book's central problem is the question how far Treitschke's teaching contributed effectively to building up the political mentality which made the European catastrophes of the twentieth century possible. Professor Dorpalen is inclined to answer this question positively, with some qualification. He rightly links up Tirpitz with Treitschke, but emphasizes at the same time that the direct appeal of his books disappeared in William II's time. This statement can probably not be applied correctly to those students who trained for a career as history specialists in German grammar schools during the first third of the twentieth century. Professor Dorpalen's observations on Treitschke's character are carefully balanced. The reader is shown on many pages that servility never motivated the thought and action of this herald of the Hohenzollern dynasty, who ended as an outspoken and bitter critic of William II's politics and behaviour. The concentration on his subject's effect on currents and events in the twentieth century has reduced the author's interest in the spiritual and intellectual origins of Treitschke's thought. For adequate information on his connection with the intellectual currents of the earlier nineteenth century the reader has to turn to W. Bussmann's *Treitschke* (Göttingen, 1952), a monograph quoted by Professor Dorpalen, where the historian's 'world-picture' in his formative years is thoroughly discussed. An appreciation of the legacy left by the literary revival of 1800, which remained an important factor during the age of Bismarck, is essential not only for the understanding of Treitschke himself but also for that of the professional classes which thought and acted under his influence.

*University of Liverpool*

HANS LIEBESCHÜTZ

Edward Blake was a Canadian Liberal, of Irish Protestant descent, and a strong supporter of Home Rule for Ireland. In 1892, being temporarily estranged from his own party, he accepted an invitation from the anti-Parnellites to enter Irish politics, and from that year until 1907 he represented South Longford in the British House of Commons. In *EDWARD BLAKE: IRISH NATIONALIST* (University of Toronto Press, 1957. xii + 370 pp. 45s.) Dr. Margaret A. Banks attempts 'to describe and evaluate, in the light of all the available material, whether it is true, as is sometimes asserted, that he did not

accomplish a great deal'. Dr. Banks has based her book mainly on the great collection of Blake papers in Toronto, but she has made use also of other collections, both Canadian and Irish, and especially of the John Dillon and John Redmond papers, now in Dublin. The book is, in effect, a study of Irish Nationalist politics between 1892 and 1907, with special attention to the part played by Blake. Dr. Banks does not claim that that part was decisive, but she perhaps gives it more importance than it deserves. Blake's advice was valued by the Nationalist leaders, and his success in raising money, especially in Canada, was of great service to the party; but the expectation that he would speedily heal the breach between Parnellites and anti-Parnellites was not fulfilled, and in the end he left little permanent mark on Irish politics. The main interest of his Irish career probably lies in the fact he combined nationalism and imperialism in a manner more congenial to the political atmosphere of Canada than to that of Ireland.

*Queen's University, Belfast.*

J. G. BECKETT

THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL INFLUENCE OF METHODISM IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY. By Robert F. Wearmouth. London: Epworth Press. 1957. xiii + 265 pp. 35s.

This fierce, unusual, rather confused book, the product of a striking but not unfamiliar attitude, derives its moral indignation from the Jewish prophets, its sociology and politics from the Labour Party, and not a little of its rhetoric from Ramsay MacDonald. (E.g., on p. 16, 'Success, however, brings new responsibilities, challenges, and obligations. All things change; the world is never at rest; tides ebb and flow, moons wax and wane; there are seed-times and harvests, Decembers and Junes. . . .') The material is presented in four sections. The first contains a well-known version of domestic history mainly this side of 1900, and is remarkable only for its author's lavish use of untabulated statistics. The second gives an account of what he considers the decline of Methodism since 1906, and of the movement for Methodist union; it is a tract for the times. The third and largest section illustrates the part played by Methodists and other free churchmen in trade union activity since the later nineteenth century, and the fourth includes an interesting chapter on Methodists as pioneers of social services.

The third section is potentially the most useful, not least because it concerns a subject, and a region, about which the author is peculiarly fitted to write. It is copious and lively, but the way it has been conceived limits its usefulness, and the way the material has been used prevents it from being more than, at best, provisionally authoritative. Dr. Wearmouth is perfectly untroubled by the kind of questions which historians viewing the working-classes and nonconformity must ask about their inter-connections; he writes from within a movement, with all its earnestness and partisan passion; he has few doubts, and only a limited curiosity, about it. Moreover, nearly two-thirds of the section is on Northumberland and Durham unionism, and most of the biographical material for the whole section comes straight from the minutes of the Northumberland Miners' Association or from a couple of Durham newspapers, which no serious historian of whatever political affiliation will be ready to swallow whole and undiluted.

It is sad that such energy and devotion as Dr. Wearmouth's have not been allied to higher standards of objectivity and normal 'professional' method.



His notions of what constitute historical evidence, and his view of his subject, at once narrow and enthusiastic, combine to diminish his book's value. What could have been a sound, calm contribution to knowledge concerning that connection between nonconformity and Labour politics, which lies at the core of his subject, and about which he knows so much, turns out instead to be of a calibre to convert only the simple, and to convince only the converted.

*Trinity Hall, Cambridge*

G. F. A. BEST

THE YOUNG TURKS: PRELUDE TO THE REVOLUTION OF 1908. By E. E. Ramsaur, Jr. Princeton University Press; Oxford University Press, 1957. xii + 180 pp. 32s.

Scant attention has been given, at least by historians writing in English, to the Young Turk movement which came to a head in 1908, and even less to the early manifestations of that movement in the closing years of the nineteenth century. This volume contains chapters on the background to the Young Turk movement, on the birth of the Committee of Union and Progress and its collapse in 1897, on the first Congress of Ottoman Liberals (held at Paris in 1902), on the revival of the movement within the Ottoman Empire and the second Congress of Ottoman Liberals (convened at Paris in 1907), and on the rôle of the Great Powers in relation to the Young Turks during the years before 1908. There are also bibliographical notes concerning the materials available to the author and, in addition, a full list of memoirs, biographies, general works and articles dealing with the events of that time. A notable feature of the volume is that it incorporates information obtained from several Turkish personalities who were connected with the Young Turk movement in the period of its inception, growth and ultimate success. Dr. Ramsaur has written a book which is valuable both for its lucid and careful treatment of a complex subject and for the fact that it does much to fill a serious gap in the historical literature relating to the Young Turks.

*School of Oriental and African Studies, London*

V. J. PARRY

STUDIES IN SECRET DIPLOMACY DURING THE FIRST WORLD WAR. By W. W. Gottlieb. London: Allen and Unwin. 1957. 430 pp. 35s.

These studies deal with the entry of Turkey and of Italy respectively into the 1914-18 war and seem to be designed primarily to illustrate the rivalries and suspicions animating Powers which, nominally at least, were allies. In the case of Turkey, since Britain, France and Russia had long been interested in the Near East, her entry into the war was sure to raise some awkward problems for the statesmen concerned; but whether Dr. Gottlieb correctly expounds their motives and reactions is questionable. We may take, for example, his handling in this respect of the Dardanelles campaign when, as on pp. 85-7, he expounds the advantages which Britain could hope to gain from its successful prosecution. These, he concludes, were three—the first strategic, the second diplomatic (a success would strengthen the hand of British diplomacy), the third, 'and greatest', political (apparently the application of naval power 'to an extension of the British Empire in the Levant'). It would seem obvious, however, that by far the greatest advantage anticipated was the first, i.e. to end the war as quickly as possible. Otherwise we are forced to conclude that the British government in question regarded the war

mainly as a welcome opportunity to pursue a programme of 'imperialist' expansion.

In the case of Italy there were two factors which seem sufficient to explain why eventually she turned against her partners in the Triple Alliance. The first (to which Dr. Gottlieb might well have given more emphasis if only because for years it had complicated all efforts to arrange military conventions between Italy and these partners) was that, with her long and vulnerable coastline, she did not care to contemplate war with Anglo-French sea-power in the Mediterranean. Nor, secondly, was Austria likely to pay the price required to win Italian support; necessarily a very heavy one if Italy were to be tempted to risk precisely this naval war. It is also apparent that though Germany might and did urge on Austria a conciliatory attitude towards Italy, she could never afford to alienate her one firm ally and the Austrians, for their part, knew this.

These studies are based on a very wide range of available sources notably including *Die Internationalen Beziehungen im Zeitalter des Imperialismus* and the *Documenti Diplomatici*. Even so, the author is obliged very often to fall back on assumptions and conjectures to establish his points. Perhaps this merely illustrates the inevitable difficulty of writing a diplomatic history of this sort. Certainly it cannot be written simply from diplomatic documents, however 'original' or even 'secret' these may be. For this reason Dr. Gottlieb was no doubt well advised to set his narrative against a wide general background. In the process he provides a good deal of interesting information about the extent of foreign investment in both Turkey and Italy. Where he is less impressive is in demonstrating exactly the connection between this financial penetration and the actual policy pursued by the governments involved. The reader may well feel that as a factor leading to the entry of Turkey or Italy into the war it may not have been so important as others.

In general Dr. Gottlieb seems to play down the importance of strategic considerations. But in war (and even 'pre-war') they are apt to become paramount and the war of 1914-18 is not the only war fought by coalitions of powers to provide some cogent illustrations of this fact.

University of Sheffield

J. E. TYLER

OCTOBER FIFTEENTH: A HISTORY OF MODERN HUNGARY, 1929-1945.

By C. A. Macartney. Edinburgh University Press. 1957. 2 vols. xvi + 1013 pp. £4 4s. the set.

HISTORY OF MODERN SLOVAKIA. By J. Lettrich. London: Thames and Hudson. 1956. 329 pp. 30s.

THE AUSTRIAN ODYSSEY. By G. Shepherd. London: Macmillan. 1957. ix + 302 pp. 30s.

Professor Macartney's latest work completes a trilogy of studies on a subject which, among Western historians, he has made peculiarly his own. No other Western historian is so profoundly versed in the history of Hungary, especially of Trianon Hungary on which he here brings to bear a phenomenal range of printed, manuscript and personal sources. Unfortunately, the book has some of the defects of its virtues. Much of the information provided by his Hungarian friends would hardly have been given to a historian less favourable towards Trianon Hungary. Macartney is not uncritical of his sources, but he is

sometimes incautious in accepting them without confirmation from non-Hungarian records, particularly in the second volume on the 1941-5 period where it would be better at present to suspend judgement. Nevertheless, he has performed a great service in utilizing this material, and it is to be hoped that unless personal considerations preclude this, he will publish it *in extenso* so that it may be compared with other sources as they appear.

Macartney's study is mainly a diplomatic history, although it also contains valuable new material on the domestic history of the Horthy régime, which it shows conclusively to have been less a régime than a racket, and to have been as frivolously incompetent as it was brutally repressive. Macartney's central theme is the Hungarian demand for 'revision' of the Trianon Treaty, a demand which he largely supports, although not to the extent of condoning extremist claims to the 'historic frontiers'. (These would have given, on your reviewer's reading of the figures, a state approximately forty per cent Magyar, the moderate claims one approximately seventy per cent Magyar, but complete certainty is impossible.) Admittedly Hungary was harshly treated in 1919, yet justice could not be done both to her and the Successor States, and she would have been wiser to accept Trianon for the sake of the peace of Central Europe. That was the view of Michael Karolyi, but it was anathema to the reactionary Magyar ruling classes, who pursued revision (eventually with all Europe burning around them) in vindictive hatred for Czechoslovakia and Rumania. The second element in their foreign policy was anti-Bolshevism, which was partly traditional Magyar Russophobia decked out for the new age (a point whose importance Macartney overlooks), and partly political-ideological hostility towards Soviet Russia and Czechoslovakia, the latter being regarded by Hitler and Horthy alike as a Russian outpost. Unteachable to the end, Horthy first proclaimed his loyalty to the Axis, and then tried to change sides the moment defeat was certain, hoping that the West would keep Russia out of Hungary. It is true that Hungary was weak, and in an impossible position between the Nazi and Soviet sledgehammers, but though some sympathy is due to Horthy, it is unreasonable to suggest, as Macartney does, that the Western Powers should have supported him. From the material packed into these sympathetic pages Horthy himself appears as a dull and incapable leader, desperately trying to salvage what he could by cheating not only Germans and Russians, but his own Ministers and generals. Nothing emerges more clearly from Macartney's masterly description of Horthy's tragi-comic declaration of neutrality on 15 October 1944, than the indifference with which the Hungarian masses saw the régime destroyed. It was as well for Hungary that Horthy went quietly into captivity, but to call him the leader of Hungarian 'resistance' to Hitler reads oddly, especially after the events of October 1956 have provided so devastating a comparison in the shape of a genuine national resistance. All the same, it is a tribute to Professor Macartney's scholarship and integrity that from the mass of invaluable information which he has compiled, less 'engaged' historians can draw conclusions very different from his. They will, indeed, be obliged to draw them from his source. Professor Macartney has written an indispensable book, and no criticisms in this review are intended to suggest that it is not a fine achievement; if he had eschewed special pleading, it could have been an incomparable one.



Dr. Lettrich's book is a useful brief account of a rarely-treated topic, concentrating on Slovak history between 1918 and 1953 from the standpoint of a Slovak who was a convinced supporter of the Czechoslovak state's pre-Munich frontiers and form of government. (Teachers should note that some of the illustrations of war crimes in the book are gruesome, and unsuitable for impressionable adolescents.) Mr. Shepherd's book, after a romantically pro-Habsburg version of the old Empire, offers an interesting account of Austrian history after the *Anschluss*. It is a readable, lively book, but it is political journalism rather than history.

*University of Hull*

FRANK SPENCER

The political and ethical problems which confronted the German Armed Forces between 1918 and 1945 have been exhaustively examined by many historians, from M. Benoist-Méchin to Dr. H. J. Gordon, and already the memoirs printed are too numerous to be mastered by anyone except specialists. Few new discoveries are to be expected in such a thoroughly worked field. None the less Dr. Waldemar Erfurth, in his *GESCHICHTE DES DEUTSCHEN GENERALSTABES VON 1918 BIS 1945* (Göttingen: Muster-schmidt, 1957. 326 pp. DM. 19.80), makes a valuable contribution to our understanding. Apart from some unpublished memoirs by General von Blomberg and an interesting memorandum on the Staff in the First World War from the Heeresarchiv, his sources are all in print; but he has mastered all the relevant material and worked it most skilfully together. He writes moreover with a specialist's knowledge of the Staff's work and organization (for Dr. Erfurth is also General Erfurth) and it is to his detailed descriptions of the structure, training and duties of the German General Staff at various stages of its development before and during the Second World War that the military historian will turn with the greatest benefit. We are shown how von Seeckt reorganized the Staff to preserve its historic functions and traditions within the framework of the Versailles limitations; how it was transformed when these limitations were denounced; and finally the form which it adopted for the conduct of the Second World War. Its achievement in reassembling the scattered fragments of the German military machine, training a new nation in arms and conducting campaigns in every quarter of Europe with unparalleled speed and efficiency was certainly astounding, and few will disagree with Dr. Erfurth's conclusion that it was 'a military institution without example in history'. This work shows something of how all this was achieved; and the academic specialist will note with interest that Dr. Erfurth attributes it in large measure to the careful study of military history and theory which has since the days of von Moltke played so large a part in the training of the German staff officer.

These detailed analyses of staff organization are set in a narrative which, although always judicious and academic in tone, is written from a viewpoint which will shock English readers whose views coincide with those of Mr. Wheeler-Bennett. Dr. Erfurth is an unashamed nationalist, who does not conceal his dislike of General Groener, his sympathy with the Freikorps and the Kapp putschists, and his approval of the attempts by von Seeckt to evade the restraints imposed on re-armament, not only by the Allied Control Commission but by the government of the Weimar Republic itself. Like von Seeckt he considers that it was the Army and not the socialist politicians

which was really responsible for the safety of the country in the 'twenties, and no more than Seeckt can he see how irreconcilable such an attitude is with the assertion that the Army was 'non-political': an argument which he uses, as do virtually all German historians, to justify the Army's failure to halt Hitler's rise to power. But the issue is too complex for the application of *a priori* standards drawn from our own quite different historical patterns, and Dr. Erfurth's clear and reasonable exposition enables us to understand the behaviour of the German High Command, if not entirely to forgive it.

King's College, London

MICHAEL HOWARD

UNHOLY ALLIANCE. By Gerald Freund. With an introduction by J. W.

Wheeler-Bennett. London: Chatto and Windus. 1957. xix + 283 pp. 25s. For nearly two centuries German-Russian relations have been playing an increasingly important part in European history, violently swinging from acute hostility to warm friendship. The book under review covers one of the most interesting chapters of the story—the co-operation based on the *Schicksalsgemeinschaft* of both countries which began soon after the Treaty of Brest Litovsk and petered out after the formal reaffirmation in the Treaty of Berlin in April 1926.

The story is extremely complex. Much is likely to remain unknown about the secret military co-operation which played a central part. Many agencies whose rôles and relations were ill-determined were involved: the Bolshevik Government, the Comintern, several Russian agents, the Red Army and the K.P.D. on the one side, the Government of the Weimar Republic, the Reichswehr and some German industrialists on the other. Dr. Freund has drawn on a variety of sources in German and in English, including some hitherto not used on the subject, such as the Streseman, Seeckt and Groener papers, and has produced an amply documented narrative which corrects several previously held mistaken views. He concentrates on the German side of the relations and analyses in detail governmental and army policies while touching rather lightly on the activities of the industrialists involved. Equally full is the story of the Communist activities in Germany and of the various Bolshevik envoys, especially Radek; but the analysis of Moscow policies is based on a secondary source, E. H. Carr's *History of the Bolshevik Revolution*, and is much less detailed, while the account of the German military and industrial establishments on Russian territory is scanty. The author has not apparently used any Russian sources, although it is by no means sure whether much additional information would transpire from those available to Western scholars. In the existing state of knowledge Dr. Freund's able account could scarcely be better. It is likely to remain the standard treatment of the topic for a long time.

King's College, Aberdeen

J. FRANKEL

GERMAN RULE IN RUSSIA 1941-1945. A STUDY OF OCCUPATION POLICIES.

By Alexander Dallin. London: Macmillan. 1957. xx + 695 pp. 60s. Using all the available German source material, together with information derived from personal interviews and correspondence and from a number of Soviet published works, Dr. Dallin has written what will undoubtedly prove to be the definitive history of German *Ostpolitik* in theory and practice

between 1941 and 1945. Wisely, the author arranges and presents his material topically rather than chronologically, with the final section on political warfare, which leads up to an examination of the antecedents, progress and consequences of the Vlasov movement, standing out, not only as the climax of the book, but as one of the most intriguing topics of study that the Second World War, in any of its aspects, seems likely to offer. While adding greatly to our knowledge on many points of detail, Dr. Dallin's researches confirm the existing impression of universal chaos and utter futility in the German administration of the so-called Eastern Occupied Territories, and make it clear that there is nothing in the German records—or, indeed, in any other—which can be adduced in extenuation of the shortcomings of that inept and sorry figure, Reichsminister Dr. Alfred Rosenberg.

C. J. CHILD

The renewal, after a gap of twenty years, of the publication of the *cahiers* of the French Revolution is to be welcomed, especially in the form of such a thorough and scholarly edition as is provided by Marc Bouloiseau for the *CAHIERS DE DOLEANCES DU TIERS ETAT DU BAILLIAGE DE ROUEN*, tome I, LA VILLE (Paris: Presses Universitaires. 1957. clxvi + 274 pp. 1000 fr.). A long and valuable introduction describes the social and economic conditions of Rouen on the eve of the Revolution and analyses the demands of the *cahiers*. Some aspects of the editor's interpretation of the *cahiers* seem hardly to be borne out by the facts which he adduces, but it will be possible to discuss these doubts more fairly when the second volume of *cahiers* has been published.

Emily Lamb, sister of Queen Victoria's first prime minister, Lord Melbourne, became in 1805 the wife of the fifth Earl Cowper, and, two years after his death in 1837, made a more remarkable alliance by her marriage with her old childhood friend Lord Palmerston, a bachelor then in his fifties. Sir Tresham Lever, in preparing *THE LETTERS OF LADY PALMERSTON* (London: John Murray. 1957. 376 pp. 28s.), has had access to a rich cache of her letters now in the possession of the Countess Mountbatten. The subjects of the correspondence are often slight—dinners, balls, society gossip, the scandal of Queen Caroline's trial, family visits and family health—and the selection might have been pruned further with profit. As Lady Palmerston, Emily had more access to political information and after 1839 her letters accordingly gain in interest.

Among the books stimulated by the mutiny of 1857 are *MY INDIAN MUTINY DIARY*, an interesting and thoughtful document by the famous *Times* correspondent, William Russell, edited by Michael Edwardes (London: Cassell. 1957. xxvii + 288 pp. 30s.), and a life of Major-General Sir Henry Havelock, who relieved Cawnpore, with a book-list but without references, by Leonard Cooper, *HAVELOCK* (London: The Bodley Head. 1957. 192 pp. 18s.).

The third edition of *A SHORT HISTORY OF MODERN GREECE 1821–1956*, by Edward S. Forster (London: Methuen. 1958. 268 pp. 18s.), is ably revised and enlarged by Dr. Douglas Dakin.



Mr. Roger Fulford in his book, *VOTES FOR WOMEN. THE STORY OF A STRUGGLE* (London: Faber and Faber. 1957. 343 pp. 25s.), traces the movement of women's suffrage from the first tentative agitation by a few pioneers in the mid-nineteenth century to the fierce campaigns of the decade before the first world war. An appendix provides a useful brief biographical index of some two hundred leaders of the movement.

### THE AMERICAS

*ÉTUDES ANTILLAISES. XVIII<sup>e</sup> SIÈCLE.* By Gabriel Debien. Paris: Armand Colin. 1956. 186 pp.

Students of West Indian history owe a considerable debt to Professor Debien, who is the author of several monographs on the colonial history of the French islands, and, in particular, of Saint-Domingue. His work in locating and analysing private papers, which reveal the history of individual fortunes, families, and plantations in that colony, has been notable. Two studies of this kind are presented in *Études Antillaises*. The first concerns the Guiton de Maulévrier plantation, established in a new district at Saint-Domingue during the eighteenth century. Maulévrier was one of the great coffee-growing hill estates, which became increasingly important after 1760. By tracing its history between 1743 and 1799, Debien illustrates with great clarity the developments by which the colony and its wealth were first built up, and then radically transformed. The plantation last appears in the hands of the Negro, Dessalines. The second study deals with the Breda sugar-estates, where Toussaint L'Ouverture lived in slavery. Toussaint's name does not appear in the papers Debien has analysed, but they afford a more exact idea of the conditions of life surrounding this greatest of the revolutionary leaders. Debien's examination reveals in some detail the workings of the great plantations, and provides a deepened knowledge of the revolutionary background in the colony.

There can be no doubt of the value of such work. Like all Debien's writings, the book is competent, authoritative, lucid. For the British islands, only Richard Pares has given us comparable analyses of private papers. The field calls urgently for more exploration.

*University College of the West Indies*

ELSA V. GOVEIA

With E. C. Guillet's collection of documents, *THE VALLEY OF THE TRENT* (Toronto: the Champlain Society. 1957. 474 pp.), the Champlain Society has inaugurated its Ontario series of publications. The present collection includes sections on discovery, settlement and communal life, on religion and education, on schemes of immigration and improvements in communication and on industry and literature during the first half of the last century. Some of the personnel may already be familiar, if dim, figures. Mr. Guillet's selection gives them character and communicates an identity to the region of the 'back lakes and back townships' during the early pioneering period which is most rewarding. His editing is full without being fussy; his general introduction adequate without being more than rather ordinary. But the documents have been allowed to speak for themselves and provide us with a notable picture of an early settlement. Mr. Guillet may be fortunate in the fact that so many of the early pioneers of the Trent valley were gifted with

the ability to write vivid description and felt impelled to use that talent. His selection indeed should prove a good model for other colonial historians dealing with similar periods elsewhere.

*Rhodes House, Oxford*

A. F. McC. MADDEN

IN JOSEPH REED: A MODERATE IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION (Columbia University Press, Oxford University Press. 1957. 298 pp. 38s.) John F. Roche has freed his subject from the toils of the furious but dreary controversy over Reed's war-time patriotism which embittered the last years of a short but active life. Reed was a moderate, not because he lacked courage or conviction, but, one suspects, because he did not see in partisan conflict the practical solutions to practical problems. He did not finally give up hope of reconciliation with Britain until he became convinced of the futility of the Howes' mission in September, 1776; until then he was evidently prepared to regard the Declaration of Independence as a bargaining counter. He was the only man apart from John Augustine Washington to whom George Washington wrote freely, and it was to Reed that Washington later confessed his military confusion of November 1776. Reed's hopes of remaining a moderate in the turmoil of Pennsylvania politics were destined to be shattered soon after he assumed the presidency of the Commonwealth: he lost his former conservative friends and was practically driven into a radicalism that was little of his choice. Mr. Roche sticks closely to his sources, which on the whole tell little more than the outline of the story; he might well have amplified the issues in this phase. Not least interesting is Reed's early example of executive leadership under a constitution that confided the principal powers to the legislature. This episode raises problems as to the development of the American version of the doctrine of the separation of powers, at which Mr. Roche does little more than hint. But it is a good biography, succinct, scholarly and clear; if there is a certain want of colour, that is perhaps a fair reflection of Reed himself.

*University College, London*

J. R. POLE

WILSON SMITH'S PROFESSORS AND PUBLIC ETHICS: STUDIES OF NORTHERN MORAL PHILOSOPHERS BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR (Cornell University Press. London: O.U.P. 1957. 244 pp. 32s.) is a collection of essays which examine the rôle of the academic moral philosopher in public affairs during a period which, in the United States, was one of exceptional social and intellectual ferment. While virtually all the moral philosophers prominent at this time in Northern pulpits and lecture-rooms receive some attention, detailed treatment is accorded only five of their number—John Daniel Gros, Francis Lieber, Charles B. Haddock, Francis Wayland and James Walker. By his thoughtful analysis of the relationship between theory and action in the careers of these men, Dr. Smith adds considerably to our understanding of early nineteenth-century American attitudes toward questions of public policy.

*University of Manchester*

M. A. JONES

Mr. Jacob E. Cooke has performed two useful services in *FREDERIC BANCROFT: HISTORIAN* (University of Oklahoma Press. 1957. xiii + 282 pp. \$4). Frederic Bancroft (1860–1944) belonged to an early, but distinguished

generation of students of American history, but was prevented, partly by his perfectionism, partly by his political and social interests, from doing justice in print to the unusual range of his travels and researches. Mr. Cooke has published three of Bancroft's manuscript essays, dealing with pre-Civil War attempts to colonize American Negroes, together with a very instructive short biography and a bibliography.

Bancroft enjoyed the acquaintance of most of the leading American historians and many of the public men of his time, was rich, and believed in a life of active and useful leisure. The biographical section makes an appreciable and attractive addition to the margins of the more familiar history of his times.

Of Bancroft's own essays, the first, on 'The Early Antislavery Movement and African Colonization', is the most important, and should not be overlooked by students of the period. The other two deal with actual attempts at colonization, in Central America and on an island off Haiti; both failed, and both reflect discredit on nearly everyone concerned except the unfortunate Negro 'colonists', once again victims of white cupidity and inhumanity. Bancroft wrote a clear and forceful narrative style, pausing occasionally for comments that reveal a searching and ironic mind.

*University College, London*

J. R. POLE

BRITISH ESSAYS IN AMERICAN HISTORY. Edited by H. C. Allen and C. P. Hill. London: Edward Arnold. 1957. 348 pp. 30s.

The last decade has seen a rapid development of the study of American history and government by British scholars. This present volume is an excellent indication of the quality of those who have turned their talents to an analysis of what Tennyson once described as the 'gigantic daughter of the West'. The older specialists on the United States, including Denis Brogan, H. H. Bellot, and John Hawgood, are represented in the volume, but most impressive is the number of newer scholars making their mark in the writing of American history. The essays sweep from the Constitutional Convention to American liberalism today, a rather flabby subject as Brogan indicates. It is most difficult to say something fresh and challenging about such thoroughly studied topics as the Constitution, Manifest Destiny, immigration, economic growth, Reconstruction, the Turner view of the frontier, and the history of American labour. Yet, the essayists in this volume succeed to a commendable degree. From their own experience in another culture with a different historical development, they bring a point of view to their specialities that commands respect.

Although there is the temptation to comment on each essay in turn, instead I will select examples that demonstrate how the volume in general presents challenging insights, and others with which I find myself in disagreement. While most American historians dealing with the mid-nineteenth century emphasize the evolution of a unique society, Frank Thistlethwaite refreshingly adds a word of caution by stressing rather a single Atlantic economy between 1815 and 1850 'directed towards the exploitation of American resources for mutual profit, than of two or more independent, and competitive economies'. While most American historians concentrate on the economic and political aspects of the growth of the trade union movement, Henry Pelling suggests the hypothesis 'that the outstanding develop-



ment of the period since 1920—the creation of the C.I.O. in 1935 and the absorption into the A.F.L. twenty years later—can largely be explained as stages in the Americanization of the “new immigration”.

Although I object to the use of the phrase ‘racial groups’ to describe European immigrants—ethnic groups is more accurate—Alan Conway’s essay ‘America, Half Brother of the World’ is a commendable discussion of a complicated subject. I object a bit, also, to Richard Pear’s analysis of the American party system. I am in hearty agreement with his able discussion of the nature of the two parties, their contribution toward forging a sense of national unity, and their high skill in the art of compromise. I do not, however, take as dim a view of the Presidential Nominating Convention as he, and many of my American colleagues, do. With the exception of Warren G. Harding in the twentieth century, I cannot agree that ‘conventions have chosen some very bad men for this high office’. Nor can I agree that ‘the platform is supremely unimportant’. Many times it is. But to mention only 1952, the Republican platform in that year with its concessions to the Republican neo-isolationists was a powerfully constricting force on President Eisenhower until the Democrats captured control of Congress two years later.

With the exception of Marcus Cunliffe’s shrewd essay on ‘the American Military Tradition’, and Max Beloff’s on ‘American Foreign Policy and World Power: 1871–1956’, the emphasis in this book is on political, economic, constitutional and western history. While Beloff writes with his usual vigour and insight, I would have liked more space to have been given to this topic. But the purpose of this book, as its editors point out, was not to write a comprehensive history of the United States. It was rather to provide an opportunity for seventeen British scholars to write essays ‘which will be interesting, not only to students and general readers but even to professional historians’. The editors and contributors have succeeded to an exceptional degree. With the rapid development during the past decade of British experts on American history, ten years from now, I suspect, future editors will have an equally impressive and undoubtedly vaster group of scholars to draw upon for the next volume of British essays on America.

*University of Chicago*

WALTER JOHNSON

The present crop of books on American history divides into three general sections, the first being contributions to joint enterprises like the Chicago History of American Civilization and the Library of American Biography; the second being the results of researches into what has been termed ‘grass roots history’ and the third being the products of reassessment and reappraisal. None of these sections are, of course, mutually exclusive.

In the first category comes Edmund S. Morgan, *THE BIRTH OF THE REPUBLIC*, 1763–89 (The Chicago History of American Civilization, ed. Daniel J. Boorstin. University of Chicago: C.U.P. 1957. 177 pp. 22s. 6d.). Professor Morgan of Yale covers the period which saw the transformation of thirteen colonies into a new nation, a period that has been worked and reworked in the greatest detail, and has produced many conflicting conclusions. Very wisely, with little more than 150 pages at his disposal, the author has refused to be drawn into a maze of economic factors and he discounts the class and sectional conflicts in favour of the theme of the Americans’ search

for constitutional principles to protect their freedom, which ultimately were to find full expression in the Constitution of the United States. In this book he has achieved a fair measure of success, although at no time having sufficient space thoroughly to develop his arguments. Undoubtedly he will come under fire from those holding divergent views of the period but he has fulfilled one of the main functions of the series and that is to stimulate thought and discussion upon the subject. The bibliographical note at the end of the volume is most useful for its analysis of the sources available to the students of these years.

A companion volume is that of John Tracy Ellis, *AMERICAN CATHOLICISM*, (University of Chicago: C.U.P. 1957. xiii + 208 pp. 22s. 6d.), which is to be followed by *American Judaism* and *American Protestantism*. The editor is to be congratulated on his courage in including such studies as these in the Chicago History because, whilst many are apathetic towards history, few are unemotional towards religion. Monsignor Ellis of the Catholic University of America surveys the history of the Catholic Church in America from the days of the Spanish and French missionaries down to the present. The narrative proceeds with a calmness and an easy grace which does credit to a scholar who refuses to acquiesce in the belief that Church and State should not mix. His emphasis upon the immigration of predominantly Catholic nationalities in the nineteenth century as the key to the increasing importance of the Catholic Church is well argued and, although all will not agree with his conclusions, there is ample food for thought for Catholics and Protestants alike.

Jeannette Mirsky, *ELISHA KENT KANE AND THE SEAFARING FRONTIER* (The Library of American Biography, ed. Oscar Handlin. London: A. and C. Black. 1957. 261 pp. 18s.), comes into the same category. Kane was a Philadelphia doctor of quite a well-to-do family who died in Havana in 1857, at the age of thirty-seven, after half a life of ill-health. In these same years, however, he went to China, Africa, South America, Europe, the Mexican War and finally (between 1850-7) accompanied the two Grinnell expeditions to the Arctic in search of Sir John Franklin. One may feel somewhat sceptical of the author's assertion that the seafaring frontier was as dynamic a factor in the history of the United States as the Western frontier, but once embarked on these expeditions, it becomes a fascinating story of the struggle to survive in the Arctic. To the layman the chances of Kane finding Franklin seem very remote, but the amount of geological, geographical, meteorological and dietary data obtained by Kane was a great achievement. Jeannette Mirsky has done justice to her subject in a strong blend of high adventure and human endurance. The publishers have done justice to the reader in producing this book at the reasonable price of eighteen shillings.

In the 'grass roots' section there are four books of greatly varying degrees of value. Andor Klay, *DARING DIPLOMACY* (University of Minnesota Press: O.U.P. 1957. 246 pp. 40s.), is the story of a Hungarian, Martin Koszta, who fled to the United States after 1848-9, declared his intention of becoming an American citizen, returned to Smyrna in 1853 on business and was there kidnapped and taken aboard an Austrian warship. His return was only secured with great difficulty and a near diplomatic breach between the two countries. Klay seems uncertain whether to write history or a novel, as for example, 'Cristo's daughter Lisa gaily breezed into her father's waterfront café to keep an early-evening date with the young Hungarian from America',

and 'Eyebrows at half-mast, Ingraham again went up on deck'. Speaking of Koszta, Iowa, he concludes, 'Before long, the township, like the forgotten man whose name it bears, will no doubt pass from original obscurity into final oblivion.' It is likely that this book will rapidly follow suit.

Portions of Roy F. Nichols's *ADVANCE AGENTS OF AMERICAN DESTINY* (Pennsylvania University: O.U.P. 1957. 254 pp. 40s.) have already appeared in a number of periodicals and have here been consolidated. This is the story of the obscure diplomatic and commercial agents of the United States who advanced American interests in Latin America, Africa and the Pacific. The adventures of William Shaler, a young Connecticut sea captain, in the first quarter of the nineteenth century in South America, Cuba, China and North Africa are of absorbing interest and quite rightly occupy a major portion of the book. In comparison, the activities of the even more obscure people who are used to pad out the volume are not only dull but tiresome.

Forest G. Hill's *ROADS, RAILS AND WATERWAYS* (University of Oklahoma Press, 1957. 240 pp. \$4) has all the earmarks of a Ph.D. thesis with its impressively detailed use of primary material, particularly from Government sources. It is all too easy to assume that the transportation system of the United States resulted largely from the efforts of private enterprise, but in this book Forest Hill has corrected the focus of the picture quite considerably by showing that, in the period between the end of the War of 1812 and the Civil War, the Army Engineers, trained at West Point, provided the vital engineering skill which private sources almost entirely lacked. The volume is well illustrated and the author has done a capable job of underlining the part played by the Corps.

Robert G. Athearn (ed.), *SOLDIER IN THE WEST: THE CIVIL WAR LETTERS OF ALFRED LACEY HOUGH* (Pennsylvania University Press: O.U.P. 1957. 250 pp. 40s.), is a valuable primary source for historians of the Civil War. Hough enlisted in the Pennsylvania Volunteers in 1861 as a sergeant, was soon commissioned and rose to the rank of Captain. He saw much service in the field but was appointed Commissary of Musters for the Army of the Cumberland and attached to the staff of General Negley and later to that of General George H. Thomas with whom he remained after the war. Hough took every opportunity to write to his wife and being an educated and literate man, with a good eye for detail, his letters are far from trivial. At times, he becomes pompous and a little priggish but nothing can hide his fanatical devotion to the North. Like so many of his contemporaries, he seemed to have little idea of 'security' but few historians would complain on that score. The editor has wisely kept his commentary to a minimum and allowed Hough to speak for himself, thereby increasing the impact and the vividness of the narrative. A book of this high standard is more than welcome.

In the third section, a longstanding need for a good biography of Gallatin has been met by Raymond Walters, Jr., in *ALBERT GALLATIN* (New York and London: The Macmillan Company. 1957. 461 pp. 49s.). Since 1879, when Henry Adams wrote his *Life of Albert Gallatin*, there has been no major work produced on Gallatin and he has been somewhat obscured by the great men of his day, and particularly by Jefferson. The author has made full use of the Gallatin papers which, until about ten years ago, remained uncatalogued and closed to the public in the keeping of the New York Historical Society, apart from other material more readily available in the United States and Geneva.



In recounting the story of his career as Secretary of the Treasury, as a diplomat and as a city banker, Dr. Walters has contributed considerably to the understanding of an epoch in American history during which the work of Gallatin was of critical importance.

A second biography under review is that of the only British writer represented, Esmond Wright, *WASHINGTON AND THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION* (Teach Yourself History series. London: English Universities Press. 1957. 192 pp. 8s. 6d.). So much has been written upon Washington that one might have thought that another book on the subject was hardly necessary. Such is not the case. Professor Wright, with an admirably fresh approach, has rescued Washington from the semi-mythological heights and made of him a likeable, because fallible, human being. The author puts forward his own interpretation of these years as well as an analysis, of necessity brief, of the larger works dealing with the subject. This is a book which is valuable not only to the general reader but also to the specialist. Finally, Dexter Perkins, *THE AMERICAN WAY* (Cornell University Press: O.U.P. 1957. 141 pp. 22s.), is a collection of essays on American Conservatism, Liberalism, Radicalism and Socialism which contain the mature reflections of a well-known and respected American historian. They are informal in approach and moderate in tone, with each of these political beliefs given credit for their contribution to American life whether it be the appreciation of the value of existing institutions by the Conservatives or the reaction of the Radicals against apathy and complacency. Professor Perkins is proud of the American way of life, as he sees it, but is aware of its faults and the need for improvement. These essays have the leisurely grace of a writer free from the bonds of 'publish or perish'.

*University College, Aberystwyth*

ALAN CONWAY

Five members of the History Department of the University of Maryland have combined to produce in *AMERICAN CIVILIZATION: A HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES* (New York: McGraw-Hill. 1957. 587 pp. illus. 50s. 6d.), edited by Wesley M. Gewehr, a thoughtful and well-conceived survey of the whole span of American history from the Discoveries to the present time. It is a balanced and clearly written introductory volume.

Under the title *THE AMERICAN STORY: THE AGE OF EXPLORATION TO THE AGE OF THE ATOM* (London: Allen and Unwin. 1957. 352 pp. 30s.) Mr. E. Schenck Miers has collected an anthology of short pieces, originally given as radio talks by some sixty American historians. Intended for the general reader, it is clearly calculated to arouse lively interest in American history.

Emma Le Conte, whose Civil War diary is edited by Earl Schenck Miers, under the title *WHEN THE WORLD ENDED* (New York: O.U.P. 1957. xviii + 124 pp. 32s.), was an impressionable girl of seventeen when her native town of Charleston was burned by Sherman's revelling troops. The episode, vividly described, was the climax of four years of gruelling endurance and diminishing hope. Her record is a lesson in what the war meant to the homes of the South and, not least important, of its influence on the minds of the young.

Howard A. Fleming's *CANADA'S ARCTIC OUTLET* (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1957. 129 pp. \$ 3.50) traces the long history of negotiations

over the Hudson's Bay Railway, through the web of political party vacillations, to the completion of the route in 1929 and its first, largely unprofitable, twenty years.

## ASIA

INDIAN HISTORICAL RECORDS COMMISSION: PROCEEDINGS: vol. xxx, part ii: HYDERABAD, FEBRUARY 1954 (160 pp.); vol. xxxi, part ii: MYSORE, JANUARY 1955 (188 pp.); SUMMARIES OF THE PAPERS, THIRTY-SECOND SESSION: PATNA, FEBRUARY 1956 (14 pp.); INDEX TO PAPERS READ AT THE INDIAN HISTORICAL RECORDS COMMISSION SESSIONS, 1920-1956 (98 pp.). Indian Historical Records Commission, New Delhi.

The Indian Historical Records Commission is a body of historians and archivists appointed by the Government of India to give advice on matters relating to the preservation and use of records. It was first appointed in 1919. At the first meeting the members resolved that in subsequent years scholars should be invited to read papers. From 1920 onwards the annual sessions of the Commission have attracted many valuable papers on topics of modern Indian history. An index has long been needed. That under review has been compiled both according to author and according to subject and will be of great utility. The *Proceedings* for 1954 and 1955 contain a number of interesting papers, ranging from the analysis of particular collections of sources to the discussion of specific historical problems. Qualitative distinctions would be invidious here, but reference may be made to two articles of special interest to students of European and British history. In the former volume Axel Linvald describes the sources relating to India in the Danish archives at Copenhagen; in the latter, Sukumar Bhattacharya uses the recently-opened Curzon-Hamilton correspondence in the India Office Library to throw new light upon some of Curzon's problems as Viceroy, especially upon his disagreements with Queen Victoria concerning the proper treatment to be accorded to Indian princes. As in previous years the nineteenth is the century which has attracted most attention. The *Summaries of the Papers* read in 1956 are very short and of comparatively little value. It is greatly to be hoped that the papers themselves will in due course be printed in full.

*School of Oriental and African Studies, London*

K. A. BALLHATCHET

CHINESE SOCIETY IN THAILAND: AN ANALYTICAL HISTORY. By G. William Skinner. Cornell University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 1957. xvii + 459 pp. 52s.

In this beautifully produced book the former Director of the Cornell Research Centre in Bangkok, himself a competent Chinese scholar, presents a detailed and authoritative study of a subject that, with China's emergence as a major world power, has become, without any exaggeration, one of vital importance. Dr. Skinner is not a professional historian but a social scientist. He began an investigation of the 'Chinese problem' in Thailand using the methods of anthropological field work. In analysing his data, however, he felt the need for 'historical depth'. In the pursuit of this he became more and more interested in the historical background, and eventually produced a history, and an exceedingly competent one at that. The book is a mine of information, both for the historical student and for the student of current

affairs, extremely well documented and with a reference bibliography of nearly three hundred titles, composed solely of publications cited in the notes. Moreover, there are twenty-five tables, three charts and seven maps. The student of history will especially welcome the author's treatment of such subjects as the causes of Chinese immigration into Thailand, the historical relations between China and Thailand, the rise of Chinese nationalism and its effects upon Sino-Thai relations, not to mention his valuable contributions to economic history. For the student of current affairs in the Far East and South-East Asia, the last chapter dealing with contemporary Chinese society in Thailand is indispensable reading. A fine, objective piece of work, and, unlike many of its kind, extremely interesting.

*School of Oriental and African Studies, London*

D. G. E. HALL

SIAM UNDER RAMA III. By Walter F. Vella. New York: J. J. Augustin.

Monographs of the Association for Asian Studies, No. 4. 1957. 180 pp.

\$5.

Modern studies of Thai history in a European language are so few in number, and cover so small a proportion of the subject, that the student unable to read Thai is presented with a tantalizing task. Yet the very fact that Siam was the only major state of South-East Asia never to come under European domination conveys the impression that its history is, likely to be of special interest, and justifiably so, since the explanation is to be sought rather in Siamese history than in that of European activities. Hence a new contribution to our knowledge of Siam during the nineteenth century is doubly welcome; all the more so when, as in the case of Dr. Vella's book, by a judicious use of both Siamese and European sources the author presents a comprehensive and well-integrated view of a reign never previously treated thus by a Western writer.

Rama III (1824-51) has suffered much by comparison with his half-brother Maha Mongkut (1851-68), who was introduced to the English-speaking world through Sir John Bowring's account of his mission to Bangkok in 1855,<sup>1</sup> and more especially through Mrs. Leonowens's somewhat highly-coloured narrative of her experiences as governess to his children.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Vella seeks to remedy this, and to do justice to a ruler highly regarded by Siamese historians, and assessed by Henry Burney in 1826 as a better choice for the throne than Mongkut. In the process he has produced an authentic picture of the 'Old Siam' with its deep reverence for tradition, its semi-divine monarchy, the guardian of tradition, and its little empire of Laotian and Malay vassal states, together with faction-torn Cambodia, the prostrate victim of Siamese and Vietnamese rivalry.

There are pleasing studies of religion and art, in both of which there was notable achievement. Traditionalism still dominated art, and the reign has been characterized as the 'height of the afterbloom' of the classical Siamese style. In religion, however, in meeting the challenge of the newly-established Christian missions, Siamese Buddhism staged a reform movement with enduring effects upon the national life.

There is also a well-documented, though brief, survey of relations with

<sup>1</sup> *The Kingdom and People of Siam, with a Narrative of the Mission to that Country in 1855*, London, 1857.

<sup>2</sup> Anna Leonowens, *The English Governess at the Siamese Court*, Boston, Mass., 1870; re-printed London, 1954.



the West. Rama III saw the diplomatic overtures of Western powers as a grave threat to Siam's independence, but shrewdly decided that it was better to sign treaties and circumvent their undesirable provisions than to adopt a completely obstructionist attitude. By contrast, Maha Mongkut, with a better understanding of the outside world, decided—rightly—that independence could only be safeguarded by opening the door to the West. But it was through Siam's contacts with the West in Rama III's reign that this step was made possible.

Finally, special commendation must be given to Dr. Vella's bibliography, and especially his annotated list of materials in the Siamese language.

*School of Oriental and African Studies, London*

D. G. E. HALL

The history of independent Burma from 1947 to 1955 is told in a sympathetic and detailed study by Hugh Tinker—*THE UNION OF BURMA: A STUDY OF THE FIRST YEARS OF INDEPENDENCE* (Oxford University Press, for the Royal Institute of International Affairs. 1957. xiv + 424 pp. 42s.).

## GENERAL

*THE DYNAMICS OF WORLD HISTORY.* By Christopher Dawson. Edited by

John J. Mulloy. London: Sheed and Ward. 1957. xiv + 489 pp. 25s.

Mr. John J. Mulloy, who may be inferred from internal evidence to be an American disciple of Mr. Dawson and probably on the staff of La Salle College, Philadelphia, has collected what in more frivolous branches of literature might be called a Dawson omnibus-volume. Papers ranging in time from Mr. Dawson's early articles on sociology and anthropology in their relation to history (*The Sociological Review*, 1921-5) to his review of Toynbee's *Study of History in International Affairs* for 1955 are arranged, along with revised extracts from his books, in the attempt to present a systematic Dawsonian view of the history of civilization and its vicissitudes. Mr. Mulloy sums up in a concluding 'Note', as he modestly calls it, of some 17,000 words, 'on Continuity and Development in Christopher Dawson's Thought'.

It will surprise few to find that the parts of it are often better than the whole, and some of the parts better than others. Mr. Mulloy's huge Note is heavy going, at least in places, and neither Mr. Dawson's own distinction of style nor his editor's care can alter the fact that in such a collection there will be a certain amount of inevitable repetition.

The fact is that Mr. Dawson has *not* written a general treatise on social dynamics, and any reader who expects to find one in this volume will be disappointed. The fact that he has never attempted, or never published, so ambitious a work may be put down to his modesty and critical acuteness; certainly not, in a writer as prolific as he is, to shirking the task. He realizes the complexities of historical causation, where a Spengler or a Toynbee, surveying the scene from a great altitude, is apt to see only the smooth surface and to end by putting down his transcontinental time-machine in a morass of metaphors. Recognizing both the need and the demand in our time for a universal history, he expresses sober doubts whether it is yet possible to write one: 'There exists no educated public which can compare the histories of different civilizations and judge between them. Oriental history is still the preserve of the comparatively small number of specialists who are masters of

the oriental languages, and there is little common ground between them.' These lines, by the way, are from the last essay in the book, which is entitled 'Europe in Eclipse', and was appropriately published in *Criterio* of Buenos Aires. So, too, Mr. Dawson has defended the writing of 'Metahistory' in *History Today* against the assault of Mr. Alan Bullock; but his own approaches to the subject, whether in articles or in books such as *The Age of the Gods* (1928) and *Progress and Religion* (1929), both represented in these pages, have always been characterized by caution and the choice of limited objectives.

There has been 'Development in Christopher Dawson's Thought' (to quote the title of Mr. Mulloy's long Note); for example, a touch of racialism in *The Age of the Gods*, which disappears later. There are also to be found, not unnaturally in articles written at intervals over many years and for different immediate purposes, differences of emphasis, which verge on inconsistency. Thus, when writing on 'Catholicism and the Bourgeois Mind' he can emphasize that 'the character of a culture is determined not so much by its form of economic organization as by the spirit which dominates it' (p. 210), as though the two were independent; though elsewhere (e.g. pp. 30-1, 80 ff., 95) he duly associates not only primitive religions, but even the schisms and conflicts within Christendom, with their social and economic backgrounds.

Granted, however, that Mr. Mulloy has attempted more than is possible in trying to extract a system of social dynamics from Mr. Dawson's writings, he still deserves our gratitude for the collection of these articles in permanent form. Taken separately, they are usually excellent. Both Mr. Dawson's learning and his charity are catholic, not only in the sectarian but in the most honourable sense of the word. He was early enough on the scene to review Spengler, and is still with us to review Toynbee; both receive judicious and critical treatment. He knows his Marx and can quote Engels or Bukharin; Marx is condemned, inevitably, but without acrimony. Not only St. Augustine, but Gibbon and even H. G. Wells are handled fairly; whereas from Belloc or Chesterton, Wells received only a contemptuous snort. To the bourgeoisie, Christopher Dawson can be almost as rude as a communist, though without becoming heated. In 1935, he was pleading for the preservation of the agriculture and the ethos of an older England, that it should not be sacrificed to short-term economic interests. But he had to go to *The English Review* to obtain publication for these views at that time. Here indeed we may find the question that confronts one so often in reading Catholic social thinkers. This is excellent, one feels; but how much chance is there, at the political level, that such things will ever be done?

Messrs. Sheed and Ward also deserve our thanks for producing a book of 150,000 words in attractive style at what is, nowadays, a very moderate price. The printing is good; but why are printers so addicted to the letter z? To the Greco-Latin hybrid 'civilize', one grows inured, if not reconciled; but 'analyze' is neither Greek, Latin, English nor anything else but just illiterate.

University of Glasgow

A. R. BURN

## OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

- A. L. Rowse: SIR RICHARD GRENVILLE'S PLACE IN ENGLISH HISTORY. Raleigh Lecture. 1957. Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. xliii. London: O.U.P. 17 pp. 3s.
- M. McKee: THE HISTORY OF ANGLO-AMERICAN RELATIONS IN BRIEF. London: Commonwealth-America Current Affairs Unit. 1958. 40 pp. 2s. 6d.
- P. Campbell and P. Howard: AMERICA NEEDS AN IDEOLOGY. London: Muller. 1957. 184 pp. 4s.
- Voltaire: THE AGE OF LOUIS XIV. Everyman's Library No. 780. London: Dent. 1958. 475 pp. 10s. 6d.
- N. Davis (ed.): PASTON LETTERS. Clarendon Press: O.U.P. 1958. xiv + 165 pp. 12s. 6d.
- S. Nordal: HRAFNKELS SAGA FRESGODA. Trans. R. G. Thomas. Cardiff: University of Wales Press. 1958. 75 pp. 7s. 6d.
- I. E. Gray: GLOUCESTERSHIRE QUARTER SESSIONS ARCHIVES, 1660-1889 and other official records. A descriptive catalogue. Gloucester County Council. 1958. 96 pp. 6s. 6d.
- A. H. Allcroft and W. F. Masom: THE TUTORIAL HISTORY OF ROME. 6th edition revised. C. E. Robin, E. E. Doherty and B. R. I. Sealey. London: University Tutorial Press. 1958. 392 pp. 9s. 6d.
- Asbury Harpending: THE GREAT DIAMOND HOAX, ed. J. H. Miller, foreword by Glen Dawson. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1958. 211 pp. \$2.00.
- H. Fox: QUAKER HOMESPUN. The Life of Thomas Fox of Wellington, serge maker and banker, 1747-1821. London: Allen and Unwin. 1958. 132 pp. 12s. 6d.
- ESSAYS BY DIVERS HANDS. New series, vol. xxix, ed. E. V. Rieu. London: O.U.P. for the Royal Society of Literature. 1958. 146 pp. 15s.
- W. Jappe Alberts and A. L. Hulshoff (ed.): HET FRENSWEGER HANDSCHRIFT. Betreffende de Geschiedents van de Moderne Devotie. Groningen: J. B. Wolters. 1958. xxxii + 268 pp.
- J. P. Wood: THE STORY OF ADVERTISING. New York: Ronald Press Co. 1958. 512 pp. \$6.50.
- H. G. Keller: DIE WURZELN DER AMERIKANISCHEN DEMOKRATIE. Berne: Francke. 1958. 75 pp. Sw.fr. 6.50.
- G. S. N. Luckyj and others (ed.): CANADIAN SLAVONIC PAPERS II. Toronto University Press. London: O.U.P. 1958. 132 pp. 16s.
- G. Kennan: SIBERIA AND THE EXILE SYSTEM. University of Chicago Press. London: C.U.P. 1958. 244 pp. 37s. 6d.
- S. Skard: AMERICAN STUDIES IN EUROPE. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1958. 2 vols. 735 pp.
- R. C. Colodny: THE STRUGGLE FOR MADRID: The Central Epic of the Spanish Conflict 1936-7. New York: Paine-Whitman. 1958. 256 pp. \$6.00.
- O. Halecki (ed.): POLAND: EAST CENTRAL EUROPE UNDER THE COMMUNISTS. London and New York: Atlantic Books for the Mid-European Studies Center of the Free Europe Committee. 1958. 601 pp. 70s.
- Vratislav Busek and Nicholas Spulber (ed.): CZECHOSLOVAKIA. *Ibid.* 520 pp. 70s.
- S. Fischer-Galati (ed.): ROMANIA. *Ibid.* 399 pp. 70s.
- E. Helmreich (ed.): HUNGARY. *Ibid.* 466 pp. 70s.
- R. F. Byrnes (ed.): YUGOSLAVIA. *Ibid.* 488 pp. 70s.
- R. Hostache: LE CONSEIL NATIONAL DE LA RESISTANCE. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 1958. 496 pp.
- R. Yakemtchouk: LA LIGNE CURZON ET LA 11<sup>e</sup> GUERRE MONDIALE. Paris and Louvain: Nauwelaerts. 1957. 135 pp.
- Stig Rydén: PEDRO LOEFLING EN VENEZUELA 1754-1756. Madrid: Insula. 1957. 266 pp.
- J. Savant: NAPOLEON IN HIS TIME. London: Putnam. 1958. 440 pp. 30s.
- Barbara Flower and Elizabeth Rosenbaum: OPUS EPISTOLARUM DES ERASMI ROTERDAMI, Vol. XII. Indices. Clarendon Press: O.U.P. 1958. 189 pp. 42s.
- MANCHESTER PUBLIC LIBRARIES, REFERENCE LIBRARY: SUBJECT CATALOGUE. Section 929, Genealogy. Part 3. Manchester Libraries Committee. 1958.



- T. Wangemann: *MALEO EN SEKOEKOENI*, translated from the German by J. W. F. Grosskopf. Ed. G. P. J. Trumpekmann. Cape Town: Van Riebeeck Society. Vol. 38. 1957. 182 pp. 28s.
- MEDIAEVAL BRITAIN: READERS' GUIDE. London: The Library Association. County Libraries Section. 1958. 23 pp.
- Edith Hamilton: *THE ROMAN WAY TO WESTERN CIVILIZATION*. London: Muller. 1958. 159 pp. 4s.
- LINCOLNSHIRE ARCHIVES COMMITTEE: *ARCHIVIST'S REPORT*, NO. 9. March 1957-March 1958. 70 pp. 2s. 6d.
- NOTES AND RECORDS OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF LONDON. Vol. 12, No. 2. London: The Royal Society. 1957. 244 pp. 7s. 6d.
- Arrian: *THE LIFE OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT*. Trans. Aubrey de Sélincourt. Penguin Classics Series. 1958. xvii + 256 pp. 3s. 6d.
- R. A. Pelham: *FULLING MILLS: A STUDY IN THE APPLICATION OF WATER POWER TO THE WOOLLEN INDUSTRY*. London: Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. 1958. 16 pp. 3s.
- A. Toynbee: *CHRISTIANITY AMONG THE RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD*. London: O.U.P. 1958. 116 pp. 8s. 6d.
- THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE HONOURABLE SOCIETY OF CYMMRODORION. 1958. London: The Society. 209 pp.
- VICTORIAN BRITAIN. READERS' GUIDE. London: The Library Association. 1958. 32 pp. 1s.
- Dorothy Whitelock: *CHANGING CURRENTS IN ANGLO-SAXON STUDIES*. Inaugural Lecture. London: C.U.P. 1958. 32 pp. 3s. 6d.
- C. F. Palmstierna (ed.), E. M. Wilkinson (trans.): *MY DEAREST LOUISE*. Letters of Marie Louise and Napoleon, 1813-14. London: Methuen. 1958. 267 pp. 25s.
- E. Newgass: *AN OUTLINE OF ANGLO-AMERICAN BIBLE HISTORY*. London: Batsford. 1958. 56 pp. 25s.
- S. E. Morison: *AMERICAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE STRATEGY OF WORLD WAR II*. London: O.U.P. 1958. 80 pp. 12s. 6d.
- W. T. Hagan: *THE SAC AND FOX INDIANS*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1958. 287 pp. \$5.00.
- J. C. Ewers: *THE BLACKFEET*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1958. 348 pp. \$5.75.
- L. Hombis: *LA SIBERIE*. Paris: Presses Universitaires (Que' sais-je?). 1957. 128 pp.
- W. E. Leuchtenburg: *THE PERILS OF PROSPERITY, 1914-32*. University of Chicago Press. London: C.U.P. 1958. 313 pp. 26s.
- E. J. Rozek: *ALLIED WARTIME DIPLOMACY: A PATTERN IN POLAND*. London: Chapman and Hall. New York: John Wiley. 1958. 481 pp. 56s.
- H. H. Peckam: *THE WAR FOR INDEPENDENCE: A MILITARY HISTORY*. University of Chicago Press. London: C.U.P. 1958. 227 pp. 27s. 6d.
- J. M. Bloch: *MISCEGENATION, MELALEUKATION AND MR. LINCOLN'S DOG*. New York: Schaum. 1958. 69 pp.
- E. Younger, ed.: *INSIDE THE CONFEDERATE GOVERNMENT: THE DIARY OF ROBERT GARLICK HILL KEAN*. London: O.U.P. 1958. 244 pp. 35s.
- H. S. Merrill: *BOURBON LEADER: GROVER CLEVELAND AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY*. London: Black. 1958. 224 pp. 18s.
- I. Knox: *RABBI IN AMERICA: THE STORY OF ISAAC M. WISE*. London: Black. 1958. 173 pp. 18s.
- B. Branston: *THE LOST GODS OF ENGLAND*. London: Thames and Hudson. 1958. 194 pp. 25s.
- E. A. Hoebel: *MAN IN THE PRIMITIVE WORLD, AN INTRODUCTION TO ANTHROPOLOGY*. London: McGraw-Hill. 1958. 2nd edit. 678 pp. 52s. 6d.
- G. Clark: *ARCHAEOLOGY AND SOCIETY*. 3rd edit. London: Methuen. 1957. 272 pp. 25s.
- L. Cottrell: *THE ANVIL OF CIVILISATION*. London: Faber. 1958. 187 pp. 25s.
- M. Reinhard: *L'ENSEIGNEMENT DE L'HISTOIRE*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 1957. 142 pp.
- W. S. Hill-Reid: *JOHN GRANT'S JOURNEY. A CONVICT'S STORY, 1803-11*. London: Heinemann. 1957. 221 pp. 21s.
- INTERNATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES, vol. xxiv. 1955. Paris: Armand Colin. 402 pp. 1957.

- Arnold J. Toynbee: *EAST TO WEST: A JOURNEY ROUND THE WORLD*. Oxford University Press. 1958. 243 pp. 21s.
- Otto Rühle: *VOM UNTERTAN ZUM STAATS-BÜRGER*. Berlin: Kongress Verlag. 1958. 448 pp.
- Geoffrey Ashe: *KING ARTHUR'S AVALON: THE STORY OF GLASTONBURY*. London: Collins. 1957. 384 pp. 18s.
- Anne Ashley: *THE CHURCH IN THE ISLE OF MAN*. St. Anthony's Hall Publications No. 13. London and York. 1958. 28 pp. 3s. 6d.
- Philip Hepworth: *ARCHIVES AND MANUSCRIPTS IN LIBRARIES*. Library Association Pamphlet No. 18. London. The Library Association. 1958. 30 pp. 5s.
- William E. Channing: *UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER ESSAYS*. American Heritage Series No. 21. New York: Liberal Arts Press. 1957. 121 pp. 80 cents.
- Mark Graubard and J. Parker. trans. and ed.: *TIDINGS OUT OF BRAZIL*. Minnesota University Press; London: O.U.P. 1958. 48 pp. 40s.
- Czeslaw Jęśman: *THE RUSSIANS IN ETHIOPIA*. London: Chatto and Windus. 1958. 160 pp. 25s.
- W. K. Ferguson and G. Brunn: *A SURVEY OF EUROPEAN HISTORY*. Part I, to 1660. 3rd edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 1958. xlv + 480 pp. \$6.25.
- H. O. Taylor: *THE CLASSICAL HERITAGE OF THE MIDDLE AGES*. 4th edition. London: Constable. 1958. 416 pp. 36s.
- A. Luchaire: *SOCIAL FRANCE IN THE TIME OF PHILIP AUGUSTUS*. 2nd edition. London: Constable. 1958. 441 pp. 45s.
- JAHRBUCH DER DEUTSCHEN DEMOKRATISCHEN REPUBLIK*. 1957. Berlin: Verlag die Wirtschaft. 1957. 520 pp.
- STATISTISCHES JAHRBUCH*. 2 Jahrgang. Berlin: Deutscher Zentral Verlag. 1957. 683 pp. DM. 19.
- J. R. A. Bailey: *NATIONAL AMBITIONS*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1958. 227 pp. 25s.
- F. Watson and M. Brown: *TALKING OF GANDHI*. London: Longmans. 1957. 191 pp. 12s. 6d.
- M. Hinrichsen (ed.): *ORGAN AND CHORAL ASPECTS AND PROSPECTS*. London: Hinrichsen. 1958. 181 pp. 15s.
- F. Carstberg: *NORWAY AND THE WESTERN POWERS: A STUDY OF COMPARATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL LAW*. Oslo University Press; London: Allen and Unwin. 24 pp. 3s. 6d.
- V. Ehrenberg: *DER STAAT DE GRIECHEN*. 2 vols. 2nd edition. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 242 pp. DM. 16.90.
- G. C. Mendis: *CEYLON TODAY AND YESTERDAY*. Colombo: Associated Newspapers of Ceylon. 1958. 148 pp. Rs. 4.50.
- J. Paquet: *SALAIRES ET PREBENDES DES PROFESSEURS DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE LOUVAIN AU XV<sup>e</sup> SIÈCLE*. Leopoldville: Editions de l'Université. 1958. 35 pp. 30 fr.
- TRANSACTIONS OF THE JEWISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY*, vol. xviii, 1953-5. 1958. 324 pp. £2 2s.
- S. Thalheimer: *MACHT UND GERECHTIGKEIT EIN BEITRAG ZUR GESCHICHTE DES FALLES DREYFUS*. Munich: C. H. Beck. 1958. 823 pp.
- A. L. Morton: *THE EVERLASTING GOSPEL*. A study in the Sources of William Blake. London: Lawrence and Wishart. 64 pp. 7s. 6d.
- D. H. Varley and H. M. Matthew: *THE CAPE JOURNALS OF ARCHDEACON N. J. MERRIMAN. 1848-55*. Cape Town: The Van Riebeeck Society. 1957. 243 pp. 28s.
- Janet Hampden (ed.): *RICHARD HAKLUYT: VOYAGES AND DOCUMENTS*. London: O.U.P. 1958. 471 pp. 8s. 6d.
- B. J. Cork: *RIDER ON A GREY HORSE: A LIFE OF HODSON OF HODSON'S HORSE*. London: Cassell. 178 pp. 21s.
- D. Novarr: *THE MAKING OF WALTON'S LIVES*. Cornell Studies in English, vol. xli. Cornell University Press; London: O.U.P. 1958. 527 pp. 52s.
- E. Holt: *THE BOER WAR*. London: Putnam. 1958. 317 pp. 25s.
- G. Mobus: *DIE POLITISCHEN THEORIEN VON DEN ANFANGEN BIS ZU MACCHIAVELLI*. vol. i. Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag. 1958. 217 pp.
- John Swarbrick: *ENGLAND'S TRIBUTE TO THE ARCHITECTS AND CRAFTSMEN OF FRANCE*. Cheam: Wykeham Press. 1956. ix + 48 pp. 6s.

- J. L. Phelan: *THE MILLENIAL KINGDOM OF THE FRANCISCANS IN THE NEW WORLD: A STUDY OF THE WRITINGS OF GERONIMO DE MENDIETA*. University of California Press. 1956. 159 pp. \$3.
- W. S. Hill-Reid: *JOHN GRANT'S JOURNEY*. London: Heinemann. 1957. 222 pp. 21s.
- M. Beloff (ed.): *EUROPE AND THE EUROPEANS*. London: Chatto and Windus. 1957. 288 pp. 25s.
- Gabriel Chevallier: *LYON 2000*. Paris: Presses Universitaires. 1958. 318 pp. 900 fr.
- INDEX TO THE FOREIGN AND POLITICAL DEPARTMENT RECORDS. Vol. I 1756-1780. Delhi: National Archives of India. xii + 548 pp. 23s. 6d.
- Gerald S. Graham: *EMPIRE OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC: THE MARITIME STRUGGLE FOR NORTH AMERICA*. 2nd edition. Oxford University Press. 1958. xiii + 338 pp. 30s.
- Angus Heriot: *THE FRENCH IN ITALY 1796-99*. London: Chatto and Windus. 1957. 316 pp. 30s.
- D. Creighton: *DOMINION OF THE NORTH*. New edition. London. Macmillan. 1957. 619 pp. 25s.
- Avery Craven: *THE COMING OF THE CIVIL WAR*. 2nd edition. University of Chicago Press: Cambridge University Press. 1957. 491 pp. 37s. 6d.
- Francis Parkman: *FRANCE AND INDIA IN NORTH AMERICA. A SELECTION*. ed. S. E. Morison. London: Faber. 1956. 533 pp. 30s.
- C. Jay Smith, Jr.: *THE RUSSIAN STRUGGLE FOR POWER, 1914-1917: A STUDY OF RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY DURING THE FIRST WORLD WAR*. New York: Philosophical Library. 1956. 553 pp. \$4.75.
- Georg Schreiber: *IRLAND IM DEUTSCHEN UND ABEND LÄNDLISCHEN SAKRALRAUM. Arbeitsgemeinschaft für forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen*. Westdeutscher Verlag. 120 pp. 1956.
- A. W. Wade-Evans: *THE EMERGENCE OF ENGLAND AND WALES*. Wetteren, Belgium: De Meester (Great Britain: Coram Ltd.). 1956. 185 pp.
- Jean Bérard: *LA COLONISATION GRECQUE DE L'ITALIE MÉRIDIONALE ET DE LA SICILE DANS L'ANTIQUITÉ*. Paris: Presses Universitaires. 2nd ed. revue. 1957. 518 pp. 1800 fr.
- Harrison Smith: *BRITAIN IN MALTA*. Valetta, Malta: Progress Press Coy. 1956. 2 vols. xvii + 257 pp., xviii + 204 pp. 22s. 6d.
- K. L. Wood-Leigh: *A SMALL HOUSEHOLD OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY*. Manchester University Press. 1956. 90 pp. 18s.
- A SHORT HISTORY OF HIND-PAKISTAN*. Karachi: Pakistan Historical Society. 1955. xx + 484 pp. Rs. 10.
- E. Weyman: *DIE NEUERE GESCHICHTE IN DEN SCHULBÜCHEN EUROPAISCHER LÄNDER*. Braunschweig: Albert Limbach. 1956. 110 pp.
- O-E. Schüddekopf: *DIE INTERNATIONALE SCHULBUCHARBEIT. EINE BIBLIOGRAPHIE*. Braunschweig: A. Limbach. 1956. 84 pp.
- Jedrzej Giertych: *POLAND AND GERMANY*. London: the author. 1958. 158 pp. 7s.
- J. S. Purvis: *THE CONDITION OF YORKSHIRE CHURCH FABRICS 1300-1800*. London and York: St. Anthony's Press. 1958. 39 pp. 3s. 6d.
- Raymond Aron: *WAR AND INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY*. Auguste Comte Memorial lecture No. 3. O.U.P. 1958. 63 pp. 7s. 6d.
- Fitzgerald Ross: *CITIES AND CAMPS OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES*. ed. R. B. Harwell. University of Illinois Press. 1958. xxii + 262 pp. \$4.50.
- Robert Aron: *THE VICHY REGIME 1940-44*. Trans. by H. Hare. London: Putnam. 1958. 536 pp. 42s.
- A. Tetens: *AMONG THE SAVAGES OF THE SOUTH SEAS. MEMOIRS OF MICRONESIA, 1862-8*. Trans. by F. M. Spoechr. Stanford University Press: O.U.P. 1958. 107 pp. 25s.
- B. Colgrave: *THE VENERABLE BEDE AND HIS TIMES*. Jarrow lecture. Jarrow-on-Tyne, the Rectory. 1958. 16 pp. 2s.
- C. H. Haskins: *STUDIES IN MEDIAEVAL CULTURE*. New York: Ungar. 1929. London: Constable. 1958. 294 pp. 45s.



# INDEX TO VOLUME XLIII

## BOOKS REVIEWED OR NOTICED

(references to short notes are in *italics*; school books are not indexed)

- Addis, *The Crawshay Dynasty*, 251.  
 Albertini, *Origins of the War of 1914*, vol. iii, 156.  
 Allen and Hill (ed.), *British Essays in American History*, 270.  
 Aspinall-Oglander, *Freshly Remembered: Thomas Graham, Lord Lynedoch*, 254.  
 Athearn (ed.), *Soldier in the West*, 273.  
 Ayalon, *Gunpowder and Firearms in the Mamluk Kingdom*, 50.  
 Backus, *Motives of West Russian Nobles in deserting Lithuania. 1377-1514*, 225.  
 Bagby, *Culture and History*, 214.  
 Bahlman, *The Moral Revolution of 1688*, 240.  
 Banks, *Edward Blake*, 260.  
 Bastin, *The Native Policies of Sir Stamford Raffles*, 164.  
 Baxter, *The Development of the Treasury, 1660-1702*, 146.  
 Bemis, *John Quincy Adams and the Foundation of American Foreign Policy; John Quincy Adams and the Union*, 77.  
 Bennett, *White Kennett 1660-1728*, 147.  
 Bibby, *The Testimony of the Spade*, 124.  
 Biobaku, *The Egba and their Neighbours*, 160.  
 Bolton, *Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland*, 241.  
 Bouloiseau (ed.), *Cahiers de doléances de Rouen. t. I. La ville*, 267.  
 Boussard, *Le Gouvernement d'Henri II Plantagenet*, 85.  
 Bradford, *Ancient Landscapes*, 216.  
 de Brébeuf, *Les Relations de ce qui s'est passé au pays des Hurons*, 73.  
 Brogan, *The French Nation from Napoleon to Pétain*, 150.  
 Brook, *Whitgift and the English Church*, 141.  
 Brooke, *The Chatham Administration*, 59.  
 Brown, L. W., *The Indian Christians of St. Thomas*, 79.  
 Brown, R. E., *Charles Beard and the Constitution*, 76.  
 Brodie and Rabinowitz (ed.), *Studies in Jewish History: Büchler*, 45.  
 Bruce, *The Shaping of the Modern World*, vol. I, 252.  
 Bulloch, *Adam of Dryburgh*, 230.  
 Bultmann, *History and Eschatology*, 170.  
 Burne, *The Agincourt War*, 51.  
 Burt, *Evolution of the British Empire and Commonwealth*, 66.  
 Butterfield, *George III and the Historians*, 247.  
 Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous, Vol. IV, 1377-1388, 226.  
 Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem: Henry VII, vol. iii, 138.  
 Calendar of Kent Feet of Fines to the end of Henry III's reign (ed. Churchill, Gifford and Hardman), 133.  
 Cam, *Selected Historical Essays of F. W. Maitland*, 231.  
 Catton, *This Hallowed Ground*, 78.  
 Caraman, *Henry Morse*, 237.  
 Chaplais (ed.), *Treaty Rolls, Vol. I, 1234-1325*, 224.  
 Chapman, J. M. and B., *Life and Times of Baron Haussmann*, 150.  
 Churchill, *History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, vol. iii, 243.  
 Clark, Sir G., *Early Modern Europe*, 160.  
 Clay (ed.), *Early Yorkshire Charters*, vol. x, 52.  
 Clive, *Scotch Reviewers: The 'Edinburgh Review' 1802-1815*, 256.  
 Cobban, *History of Modern France*, vol. i, 71.  
 Cohn, *Pursuit of the Millennium*, 47.  
 Colie, *Light and Enlightenment*, 56.  
 Cooke, *Frederick Bancroft, Historian*, 269.  
 Cooper, *Havelock*, 267.  
 Coulborn (ed.), *Feudalism in History*, 45.  
 Cowherd, *Politics of English Dissent*, 64.  
 Cragg, *Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution 1660-1688*, 238.  
 Cranston, *John Locke*, 56.  
 Crouzet, *L'Époque contemporaine*, 158.  
 Curia Regis Rolls, vol. XII 1225-1226, 132.  
 Dallin, *German Rule in Russia 1941-1945*, 266.  
 Daniel-Rops, *Cathedral and Crusade: Studies of the Medieval Church, 1050-1350*, 128.  
 Davies, *The Royal African Company*, 144.  
 Davis, C. T., *Dante and the Idea of Rome*, 225.  
 Davis, R. H. C., *A History of Medieval Europe*, 127.  
 Dawson, *Dynamics of World History*, 277.  
 Debién, *Études Antillaises*, 268.  
 Denholm-Young (ed.), *Vita Edwardi Secundi*, 134.

- Denman, *Origins of Ownership*, 221.  
 Derry, *Short History of Norway*, 170.  
 Diké, *Trade and Politics in the Niger Delta*, 66.  
 Djordjevic, *Serbia's Outlet to the Adriatic Sea*, 73.  
 Dorgalen, *Heinrich von Treitschke*, 259.  
 Dray, *Laus and Explanation in History*, 214.  
 Du Boulay (ed.), *Registrum Thome Bourghier*, 138.  
 Duggan, *Devil's Brood*, 52.  
 Dunlop, A. I. (ed.), *Calendar of Scottish Supplications to Rome, 1422-1428*, 52.  
 Dunlop, J. K., *Short History of Germany*, 149.  
 Durden, *James Shepherd Pike: Republicanism and the American Negro, 1850-1882*, 110.  
 Easson, *Medieval Religious Houses*, 223.  
 Edwardes (ed.), *My Indian Mutiny Journal by William Russell*, 267.  
 Egerton, *Angola in Perspective*, 160.  
 Ekwall, *Studies on the Population of Medieval London*, 134.  
 Ellis, K., *Post Office in the Eighteenth Century*, 246.  
 Ellis, J. T., *American Catholicism*, 272.  
 Erfurth, *Die Geschichte des Deutschen Generalstabes von 1918 bis 1945*, 265.  
 Falk, *History of Germany from the Reformation*, 149.  
 Finch, *The Wealth of Five Northamptonshire Families 1540-1640*, 142.  
 Fleming, *Canada's Arctic Outlet*, 274.  
 Forster, *Short History of Modern Greece*, 267.  
 Franciscan Fathers, *Dun Mhuire, Father Luke Wadding*, 237.  
 Fraser, *Antony Bec*, 48.  
 Freund, *Unholy Alliance*, 266.  
 Fricke, *Leibniz und die englische Sukzession*, 245.  
 Fulford, *Votes for Women*, 268.  
 Garrett, *Sherman's March through the Carolinas*, 78.  
 Genner, *England und der Schweiz von 1870 bis 1890*, 72.  
 Gewehr, *American Civilization*, 274.  
 Gewirth (ed.), *Marsilius of Padua: Vol. ii, The Defensor Pacis*, 227.  
 Gibb and Bowen, *Islamic Society and the West*, vol. i, pt. ii, 244.  
 Gomme, *Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, 43.  
 Gottlieb, *Studies in Secret Diplomacy*, 262.  
 Gray and Walker, *Records of the Borough of Nottingham*, Vols. viii, ix, 255.  
 Gray, Sir J., *The British in Mombasa 1824-26*, 160.  
 Gray, M., *The Highland Economy 1750-1850*, 250.  
 Gross, *Charles Joseph La Trobe*, 257.  
 Grotian, *Das Sowjetische Regierungssystem*, 67.  
 Guillet (ed.), *The Valley of the Trent*, 268.  
 Hadas, *A History of Rome*, 219.  
 Hamilton, *Barbados and the Confederation Question 1871-1885*, 73.  
 Handover, *Arbella Stuart*, 234.  
 Hawes, *Henry Brougham*, 154.  
 Hay, *Europe: the Emergence of an Idea*, 231.  
 Hertz, *Development of the German Public Mind*, 149.  
 Herzfeld, *Die Moderne Welt 1789-1945*, 252.  
 Hill Roads, *Rails, and Waterways*, 273.  
 Hollon and Butler (ed.), *William Bollaert's Texas*, 76.  
 Hollyman, *Le Développement du vocabulaire féodal*, 52.  
 Holmes, *The Estates of the Higher Nobility in XIV Century England*, 135.  
 Holstein Diaries, ii, ed. Rich and Fisher, 72.  
 Hooke, *The Siege Perilous*, 81.  
 Hoskins (ed.), *Exeter: Tax and Rate Assessments, 1602-1699*, 240.  
 Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind*, 154.  
 Hughes (ed.), *Correspondence of Lord Collingwood*, 254.  
 Hunt, *Dean Colet and his Theology*, 231.  
 Hussey, *The Byzantine World*, 126.  
 Hyde, *Blue Funnel*, 58.  
 Indian Historical Records Commission, *Index Indian Historical Records Commission, 1920-1956; Proceedings: Vols. XXX (Pt. II) and XXXI (Pt. II)*, 275.  
 Jarvis (ed.), *Customs letter-books of the Port of Liverpool 1711-1813*, 58.  
 Jedin, *History of the Council of Trent, Vol. I*, 53.  
 Johnson and Cronne (ed.), *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum 1066-1154, Vol. II*, 85.  
 Johnson, L. G., *General T. Perronet Thompson*, 63.  
 Jones, A. H. M., *Athenian Democracy*, 217.  
 Jones, D., *The Church in Chester 1300-1540*, 225.  
 Kennan, *Russia leaves the War*, 70.  
 Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon*, 222.  
 Klay, *Daring Diplomacy*, 272.  
 Köhler, *Hebrew Man*, 43.  
 Krypton, *The Northern Sea Route and the Economy of the Soviet North*, 67.  
 Laistner, *Intellectual Heritage of the Early Middle Ages*, 220.  
 Lambarde, *Archeion*, ed. McIlwain and Ward, 233.  
 Lancaster (ed.), *Bibliography of Historical Works issued in the United Kingdom 1946-1956*, 170.  
 Latham, *Timber*, 160.  
 Lauerma, *L'artillerie de campagne française pendant les guerres de la révolution*, 60.  
 Leslie, *Polish Politics and the Revolution of November 1830*, 65.  
 Lethbridge, *Gogmagog*, 45.  
 Lettrich, *History of Modern Slovakia*, 263.  
 Lever (ed.), *Letters of Lady Palmerston*, 267.  
 Lindsay (ed.), *The New Cambridge Modern History, Vol. vii*, 241.  
 Link, *Wilson: the New Freedom*, 110.  
 Lloyd-Pritchard (ed.), *Bray, A Voyage from Utopia*, 160.  
 Macartney, *October fifteenth*, 263.  
 McCloy, *The Humanitarian Movement in Eighteenth-Century France*, 57.

- Mackesy, *The War in the Mediterranean, 1803-10*, 152.
- Mack Smith, Garibaldi, 154.
- Macmahon (ed.), *Beverley Corporation Minute Books 1707-1835*, 246.
- Malfatti (ed.), *The Accession of Mary Tudor*, 240.
- Masson, *Frederick II of Hohenstaufen*, 224.
- Mattingly, *Roman Imperial Civilization*, 219.
- Maurois, *Miss Howard and the Emperor*, 72.
- Medlicott, *Bismarck, Gladstone and the Concert of Europe*, 258.
- Mendis (ed.), *The Colebrooke-Cameron Papers*, 164.
- Middleton, Charles, *Second Earl of Middleton*, 239.
- Miers (ed.), *When the World ended: the Diary of Emma le Conte; The American Story*, 274.
- Miller, Richard Jebb and the Problem of Empire, 66.
- Mirsky, *Elulia Kent Kane and the Seafaring Frontier*, 272.
- Mitchell, *Rise of the Revolutionary Party in the English House of Commons 1603-1629*, 235.
- Moir, *The Addled Parliament of 1614*, 236.
- Morgan, E. S., *The Birth of the Republic*, 271.
- Morgan, I., *Prince Charles's Puritan Chaplain*, 236.
- Morton (ed.), Jones: *The Present State of Virginia*, 75.
- Narain, *The Indo-Greeks*, 125.
- Nicoll (ed.), *The Elizabethans*, 139.
- Nichols, *Advance Agents of American Destiny*, 273.
- Niitemaa, *Das Strandrecht in Nordeuropa im Mittelalter*, 46.
- Nugent (ed.), *Thought and Culture of the English Renaissance, 1481-1555*, 139.
- O'Brien, *Parnell and his Party*, 155.
- Oliver, *Sir Harry Johnston and the Scramble for Africa*, 163.
- Orcibal, *Port-Royal entre le miracle et l'obéissance*, 55.
- Origo, *The Merchant of Prato*, 137.
- Ozanam and Antoine, *Correspondance secrète du comte de Broglie avec Louis XV (1750-1774)*, t. I, 71.
- Packe, *The Bombs of Orsini*, 258.
- Pankhurst, *The Saint Simonians, Mill and Carlyle*, 154.
- Parrot, *Golgotha and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre*, 45; *The Temple of Jerusalem*, 45.
- Pearson, *Elizabethans at Home*, 232.
- Perkins, *The American Way*, 274.
- Petrovich, *Emergence of Russian Pan Slavism*, 67.
- Pocock, *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law*, 142.
- Popper, *The Poverty of Historicism*, 213.
- Potter, *Interiors*, 170.
- Pounds and Parker, *Coal and Steel in Western Europe*, 251.
- Powers, *Edgar Quinet*, 150.
- Pressnell, *Country Banking*, 248.
- Price, *A History of Punch*, 72.
- Prouty, *Transformation of the Board of Trade 1830-1855*, 160.
- Pugh and Crittall (ed.), *Victoria History of the County of Wiltshire*, Vol. v, 165.
- Raeff, *Siberia and the Reforms of 1822*, 67.
- Raftis, *Estates of Ramsey Abbey*, 223.
- Ramsaur, *The Young Turks*, 262.
- Randall, *Nature and Historical Experience*, 214.
- von Rauch, *History of Soviet Russia*, 162.
- Reverdin, *Quatorze Calvinistes chez les Topinambous*, 73.
- Rickard (ed.), *Progress Notes of Warden Woodward*, 240.
- Roche, *Joseph Reed*, 269.
- Römer, *England und die europäischen Mächte im Jahre 1887*, 72.
- Rowse, *The Early Churchills*, 238.
- Russell, *The 'Revolt of the Field' in Lincs.*, 160.
- St Antony's Papers Number 1, *Soviet Affairs*, 67.
- Sambursky, *Physical World of the Greeks*, 45.
- Sampson, *Progress in the Age of Reason*, 56.
- Schiffer, *The Quest for Africa*, 72.
- Schlesinger, *The Crisis of the Old Order 1919-33*, 110.
- Schmitt, G., *Les Accords Secrets Franco-Britanniques de Nov.-Dec. 1940*, 162.
- Schmitt, H. H., *Rom und Rhodos*, 125.
- Schmittlein, *La première campagne de César contre les Germains*, 44.
- Sellers, James K. Polk, *Jacksonian*, 110.
- Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusades, Vol. I, The First Hundred Years*, ed. Baldwin, 130.
- Shepherd, *The Austrian Odyssey*, 263.
- Simon, *Failure of the Prussian Reform Movement 1807-1819*, 253.
- Skinner, *Chinese Society in Thailand*, 275.
- Slingsby (ed.), *Feet of Fines for the County of York, 1272-1300*, 231.
- Smith, *Professors and Public Ethics*, 269.
- Somerset (ed.), *A Note-book of Edmund Burke*, 71.
- Städtler, *Die Ansbach-Bayreuther Truppen im Amerikanischen Unabhängigkeitskrieg*, 75.
- Stenton, Lady, *The English Woman in History*, 167.
- Stenton, Sir F. (ed.), *The Bayeux Tapestry*, 131.
- Stevens, *The Early Jackson Party in Ohio*, 110.
- Storry, *The Double Patriots*, 80.
- Striker (ed.), *The Life of John Smith by Henry Wharton*, 233.
- Stuart (ed.), *Soldier's Glory*, 254.
- Taine, *Notes on England*, 72.
- Taylor, *The Trouble Makers*, 61.
- Thomson, D., *Europe since Napoleon*, 252.
- Thomson, S. H. (ed.), *Magistri Johannis Hus, Tractatus de Ecclesia*, 227.
- Tinker, *The Union of Burma*, 277.
- Toynbee, *An Historian's Approach to Religion*, 81.
- Trevor-Roper, *Historical Essays*, 167.
- Tripathi, *Evolution of Historiography in America*, 74.



- Uhlendorf (ed.), *Revolution in America*, 75.  
 Uhlirz, *Briefe Gerberts von Aurillac, Papst Sylvesters II; Die Älteste Lebensbeschreibung des Heiliger Adalbert*, 231.  
 Vella, *Siam under Rama III*, 276.  
 Wallace-Hadrill and McManners (ed.), *France: Government and Society*, 150.  
 Walters, *Albert Gallatin*, 273.  
 Watkin, Dom A. (ed.), *Great Chartulary of Glastonbury, Vol. III*, 49.  
 Watson, *By Command of the Emperor*, 72.  
 Wearmouth, *Social and Political Influence of Methodism in the Twentieth Century*, 261.  
 Weiss, *Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century*, 52.  
 Westphalen, *Carlos-Quinto 1500-1558*, 232.  
 White, *Waterloo to Peterloo*, 152.  
 Willan, *Early History of the Russia Company*, 54.  
 Wilson, A. M., *Diderot: the Testing Years*, 57.  
 Wilson, C., *Profit and Power. A Study of England and the Dutch Wars*, 145.  
 Wilson, T. G., *Rise of the New Zealand Liberal Party*, 66.  
 Wolfe, *Three Who Made a Revolution*, 70.  
 Wood, A. S., *Thomas Haweis*, 154.  
 Wood, H. G., *Freedom and Necessity in History*, 214.  
 Woodcock (ed.), *Cartulary of the Priory of St Gregory, Canterbury*, 133.  
 Wright, *Washington and the American Revolution*, 274.  
 Yarmolinsky, *Road to Revolution*, 163.  
 Yeselson, *United States-Persian Diplomatic Relations 1883-1921*, 69.  
 Young and Hancock (ed.), *English Historical Documents, Vol. XII (1)*, 63.

## CONTRIBUTORS

- Ballhatchet, K. A., 275.  
 Baldon, J. P. V. D., 44, 125.  
 Barlow, F., 48.  
 Barrow, G. W. S., 223.  
 Basham, A. L., 79.  
 Beckett, J. C., 260.  
 Bell, H. E., 137.  
 Beloff, M., 110.  
 Best, G. F. A., 261.  
 Bien, D. D., 192.  
 Bolsover, G. H., 70.  
 Boswell, A. B., 65.  
 Brooks, F. W., 58.  
 Burn, A. R., 277.  
 Burn, W. L., 61.  
 Bury, J. P. T., 258.  
 Butterfield, H., 14.  
 Carsten, F. L., 190.  
 Chaloner, W. H., 152, 251.  
 Chambers, J. D., 255.  
 Cheney, C. R., 49.  
 Child, C. J., 266.  
 Cobban, A., 55.  
 Collins, Irene, 150.  
 Colvin, H. M., 85.  
 Conway, A., 271.  
 Court, W. H. B., 250, 251.  
 Crompton, J., 227.  
 Cunliffe, M., 74.  
 Davis, G. R. C., 222.  
 Davis, R. H. C., 131.  
 Deanesly, Margaret, 128.  
 Donaldson, G., 236.  
 Du Boulay, F. R. H., 225.  
 Dunning, P. J., 237.  
 Edwards, Kathleen, 138.  
 Elton, G. R., 167.  
 Eyck, E., 258.  
 Fowler, W. J., 34.  
 Frankel, J., 266.  
 Frend, W. H. C., 81.  
 Fukuda, K., 80.  
 Gershoy, L., 241.  
 Goveia, Elsa V., 73, 268.  
 Greaves, Rose L., 69.  
 Greaves, R. W., 64, 247.  
 Hall, D. G. E., 275, 276.  
 Hargreaves, J. D., 163.  
 Hartwell, R. M., 257.  
 Hatton, Ragnhild, 145.  
 Hawgood, J. A., 253.  
 Hay, D., 47.  
 Henderson, W. O., 252.  
 Hilton, R. H., 223.  
 Hopper, R. J., 217.  
 Howard, M., 50, 265.  
 Hughes, E., 146.  
 Hurstfield, J., 139, 142, 232, 237.  
 Hussey, Joan M., 130.  
 John, E., 45, 221.  
 Johnson, W., 270.  
 Johnston, S. H. F., 254.  
 Jones, M. A., 269.  
 Jones, P. E., 134.  
 Judge, H. G., 55.

- Kells, J. H., 43.  
 Knowles, M. D., 127.  
 Koenigsberger, H. G., 53  
  
 Laslett, P., 142  
 Latham, R. C., 147, 238, 239.  
 Le Patourel, J., 173.  
 Lewis, M. A., 152, 254.  
 Liebeschütz, H., 149, 259.  
 Lowe, C. J., 154.  
 Lynch, J., 232.  
 Lyons, F. S. L., 155.  
  
 Macfarlane, L. J., 52.  
 McGuffie, T. H., 51, 60.  
 Madden, A. F. M., 66, 268.  
 Martin, Eveline, 66.  
 Mathias, P., 248.  
 Medicott, W. N., 156.  
 Miller, E., 46, 226.  
 Momigliano, A., 1.  
 Moody, T. W., 90.  
 Mosse, W. E., 67, 225.  
 Mowat, C. L., 158.  
 Murphy, Eleanor J., 118.  
  
 Neale, Sir John, 233.  
 Nicholl, D., 225.  
  
 Parry, V. J., 244, 262.  
 Pennington, D. H., 235.  
 Pole, J. R., 269, 270.  
 Potter, G. R., 231.  
 Pugh, R. B., 133.  
 Pugh, T. B., 135, 138.  
  
 Quinn, D. B., 54, 73, 233.  
  
 Read, D., 246.  
 Roach, J., 63, 154.  
 Robertson, C. M., 216.  
 Roots, I. A., 236.  
 Ross, C. D., 224.  
 Routh, C. R. N., 243.  
  
 Schmidt, H. D., 207.  
 Scullard, H. H., 219.  
 Sharp, Margaret, 134.  
 Shepperson, G., 160.  
 Spencer, F., 263.  
 Stein, S., 43.  
 Stenton, Lady, 132.  
 Stokes, E., 164.  
 Stone, E., 133.  
 Styles, P., 165.  
  
 Taylor, A. J., 63.  
 Thomson, M. A., 238, 245.  
 Tyler, J. E., 262.  
  
 Ullmann, W., 227.  
  
 de Villiers, Lady, 167.  
  
 Wainwright, F. T., 124.  
 Walbank, F. W., 125.  
 Waley, D. P., 224.  
 Wallace-Hadrill, J. M., 220.  
 Ward, W. R., 246.  
 Watson, S., 59.  
 Weiss, R., 232.  
 White, R. J., 256.  
 Whitting, P., 126.  
 Willan, T. S., 144.  
 Williams, G., 141.  
 Willson, D. H., 234.  
 Wright, E., 70.

## CONTENTS OF VOLUME XLIII

## ARTICLES

The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography .. ..	ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO	I
Angevin Government .. ..	H. M. COLVIN	85
Edward III and the Kingdom of France ..	JOHN LE PATOUREL	173
A Note on the Term 'Thirty Years War' ..	F. L. CARSTEN	190
The Background of the Calas Affair ..	DAVID D. BIEN	192
George III and the Constitution .. ..	HERBERT BUTTERFIELD	14
The Hessian Mercenaries: the Career of a Political Cliché .. ..	H. D. SCHMIDT	207
The Irish University Question of the Nine- teenth Century .. ..	T. W. MOODY	90
Political Leadership in the American Democracy .. ..	MAX BELOFF	110
HISTORY BOOKS FOR SCHOOLS: IV .. ..	W. J. FOWLER	34
V ..	ELEANOR J. MURPHY	118

## REVIEWS AND SHORT NOTICES

Ancient .. ..	.. 43, 124, 216
Medieval .. ..	.. 45, 126, 220
Early Modern .. ..	.. 53, 138, 231
Later Modern .. ..	.. 55, 149, 241
The Americas .. ..	.. 73, 268
Asia .. ..	.. 79, 275
General .. ..	.. 81, 165, 277
EDITORIAL NOTES .. ..	.. 40, 213
OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED .. ..	.. 83, 171, 279
INDEX .. ..	.. 283













History; the journal of  
the Historical Assoc.  
ser.2  
v.43  
1958

328327

ser.2  
v.43  
1958

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY  
BERKELEY, CA 94709

GTU Library



3 2400 00292 0688



